THE

RUDIMENTS

OF

Engliſh Grammar, &c.

Juſt Publiſhed by the Printer hereof,

A

DICTIONARY

OF THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE,

One main Object of which is to eſtabliſh a plain and permanant

STANDARD OF PRONUNCIATION:

TO WHICH IS ADDED, A

RHETORICAL GRAMMAR.

By THOMAS SHERIDAN, A. M.

Dedicated to the VOLUNTEERS of IRELAND.

Price 8s. 8d.

Catherine Smythe 1786

THE

RUDIMENTS

OF

English Grammar,

Adapted to the Use of Schools;

WITH

Notes and Observations,

For the Use of Thoſe

Who have made ſome Proficiency in the Language.

By JOSEPH PRIESTLEY,
L. L. D. F. R. S.

The FOURTH EDITION.

DUBLIN:

Printed by P. BYRNE, Bookſeller, No. 35,
College Green.

M,DCC,LXXXIV.

THE

PREFACE.

IN the firſt compoſition of the *Rudiments of Engliſh Grammar*, I had no farther views than to the uſe of ſchools; and, therefore, contented myſelf with explaining the fundamental principles of the language, in as plain and familiar a manner as I could. Afterwards, taking a more extenſive view of language in general, and of the Engliſh language in particular, I began to collect materials for a much larger work upon this ſubject; and did not chuſe to republiſh the former work, till I had executed the other; as I imagined, that this could not fail to ſuggeſt ſeveral improvements in the plan of it. How-

ever, being frequently importuned to republiſh the former grammar, and being ſo much employed in ſtudies of a very different nature, that I cannot accompliſh what I had propoſed, I have, in this treatiſe, republiſhed that work, with improvements, and ſo much of the materials I had collected for the larger, as may be of practical uſe to thoſe who write the language. Theſe materials, therefore, I have reduced into as good an order as I can, and have ſubjoined them to the former grammar, under the title of *Notes and Obſervations, for the Uſe of thoſe who have made ſome Proficiency in the Language.*

I have retained the method of *queſtion and anſwer* in the *Rudiments* becauſe I am ſtill perſuaded, it is both the moſt convenient for the maſter, and the moſt intelligible to the ſcholar. I have alſo been ſo far from departing from the ſimplicity of the plan of that ſhort grammar, that I have made it, in ſome reſpects, ſtill more ſimple; and I think it, on that account, more ſuitable to the genius of the Engliſh language. I own I am ſurprized to ſee ſo much of the diſtribution, and technical terms of the Latin grammar, re-

retained in the grammar of our tongue; where they are exceedingly aukward, and abſolutely ſuperfluous; being ſuch as could not poſſibly have entered into the head of any man, who had not been previouſly acquainted with Latin.

Indeed, this abſurdity has, in ſome meaſure, gone out of faſhion with us; but ſtill ſo much of it is retained, in all the grammars that I have ſeen, as greatly injures the uniformity of the whole; and the very ſame reaſon that has induced ſeveral grammarians to go ſo far as they have done, ſhould have induced them to go farther. A little reflection may, I think, ſuffice to convince any perſon, that we have no more buſineſs with *a future tenſe* in our language, than we have with the whole ſyſtem of Latin moods and tenſes; becauſe we have no modification of our verbs to correſpond to it; and if we had never heard of a future tenſe in ſome other language, we ſhould no more have given a particular name to the combination of the verb with the auxiliary *ſhall* or *will*, than to thoſe that are made with the auxiliaries *do*, *have*, *can*, *muſt*, or any other.

The only natural rule for the uſe of technical terms to expreſs time, &c. is to apply them to diſtinguiſh the different modifications of words; and it ſeems wrong to confound the account of *inflections*, either with the grammatical uſes of the *combinations* of words, of the *order* in which they are placed, or of the *words which expreſs relations*, and which are equivalent to inflections in other languages.

Whenever this plain rule is departed from, with reſpect to any language whatever, the true ſymmetry of the grammar is loſt, and it becomes clogged with ſuperfluous terms and diviſions. Thus we ſee the optative mood, and the perfect and pluperfect tenſes of the paſſive voice, abſurdly transferred from the Greek language into the Latin, where there were no modifications of verbs to correſpond to them. The authors of that diſtribution might, with the very ſame reaſon, have introduced the dual number into Latin; and *duo homines* would have made juſt as good a dual number, as *utinam amem* is an optative mood, or *amatus fui* a perfect tenſe. I cannot help flattering myſelf, that future grammarians will

will owe me ſome obligation, for introducing this uniform ſimplicity, ſo well ſuited to the genius of our language, into the Engliſh grammar.

It is poſſible I may be thought to have leaned too much from the Latin idiom, with reſpect to ſeveral particulars in the ſtructure of our language; but I think it is evident, that all other grammarians have leaned too much to the analogies of that language, contrary to our modes of ſpeaking, and to the analogies of other languages more like our own. It muſt be allowed, that the cuſtom of ſpeaking, is the original, and only juſt ſtandard of any language. We ſee, in all grammars, that this is ſufficient to eſtabliſh a rule, even contrary to the ſtrongeſt analogies of the language with itſelf. Muſt not this cuſtom, therefore, be allowed to have ſome weight, in favour of thoſe forms of ſpeech, to which our beſt writers and ſpeakers ſeem evidently prone; forms which are contrary to no analogy of the language with itſelf, and which have been diſapproved by grammarians, only from certain abſtract and arbitrary conſiderations, and when

their deciſions were not prompted by the genius of the language; which diſcovers itſelf in nothing more than in the general propenſity of thoſe who uſe it to certain modes of conſtruction. I think, however, that I have not, in any caſe, ſeemed to favour what our grammarians will call an irregularity, but where the genius of the language, and not only ſingle examples, but the general practice of thoſe who write it, and the almoſt univerſal cuſtom of thoſe who ſpeak it, have obliged me to do it. I alſo think I have ſeemed to favour thoſe irregularities, no more than the degree of the propenſity I have mentioned, when unchecked by a regard to arbitrary rules, in thoſe who uſe the forms of ſpeech I refer to, will authorize me.

If I have done any eſſential ſervice to my native tongue, I think it will ariſe from my detecting in time a very great number of *galliciſms*, which have inſinuated themſelves into the ſtyle of many of our moſt juſtly admired writers; and which, in my opinion, tend greatly to injure the true idiom of the Engliſh language, being contrary to its moſt eſtabliſhed analogies.

I dare

I dare ſay, the collections I have made of this nature, will ſurprize many perſons who are well acquainted with modern compoſitions. They ſurprize myſelf, now that I ſee them all together; and I even think, the writers themſelves will be ſurprized, when they ſee them pointed out. For I do not ſuppoſe, that they deſignedly adopted thoſe forms of ſpeech, which are evidently French, but that they fell into them inadvertently, in conſequence of being much converſant with French authors.

I think there will be an advantage in my having collected examples from *modern writings*, rather than from thoſe of Swift, Addiſon, and others, who wrote about half a century ago, in what is generally called the claſſical period of our tongue. By this means we may ſee what is the real character and turn of the language at preſent; and by comparing it with the writings of preceding authors, we may better perceive which way it is tending, and what extreme we ſhould moſt carefully guard againſt.

It may excite a ſmile in ſome of my readers, to ſee what books paſſed through my hands at the time I was making theſe collections, and I might very eaſily have ſuppreſſed their names; but I am not aſhamed of its being known, that I ſometimes read for amuſement, and even any thing that may fall in my way. Beſides, I think there is a real advantage in making ſuch collections as theſe from books which may be ſuppoſed to be written in a haſty manner, when the writers would not pay much attention to arbitrary rules, but indulge that natural propenſity, which is the effect of the general cuſtom, and genius of the language, as it is commonly ſpoken. It is not from the writings of grammarians and critics that we can form a judgment of the real preſent ſtate of any language, even as it is ſpoken in polite converſation.

It will be no objection to the propriety, or uſe of any of my remarks with thoſe who think juſtly, that they were ſuggeſted by the peruſal of the writings of Scotchmen. It is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that they write in the Engliſh language. Many of

of their readers will not know that they were Scots. If they excel in other articles of good ſtile, their example is not the leſs dangerous; and he muſt be prejudiced to a degree that deſerves ridicule, who will not allow that ſeveral of the moſt correct writers of Engliſh are Scotchmen.

Some of my examples will be found without authorities, and many of them without references to the particular paſſage of the author. This was generally owing to mere inattention, in omitting to note the author, or the place, at the time I was reading; and afterwards, the overſight was irretrievable.

I make no apology for the freedom I have taken with the works of living authors in my collections. Except a very few pages in Swift, I read nothing with an immediate view to them. This was always a ſecondary conſideration; but if any thing of this kind ſtruck me in the courſe of my reading I did not fail to note it. If I be thought to have borne harder upon Mr. Hume than upon any other living author, he is obliged for it to the great

great reputation his writings have juſtly gained him, and to my happening to read them at the time that I did; and I would not pay any man, for whom I have the leaſt eſteem, ſo ill a compliment, as to ſuppoſe, that exactneſs in the punctilios of grammar was an object capable of giving him the leaſt diſturbance. This is the ſmalleſt point of excellence, even with reſpect to ſtyle; and ſtyle, in its whole extent, is but a very ſmall object in the eye of a philoſopher. I even think a man cannot give a more certain mark of the narrowneſs of his mind, and of the little progreſs he has made in true ſcience, than to ſhow, either by his vanity with reſpect to himſelf, or the acrimony of his cenſure with reſpect to others, that this buſineſs is of much moment with him. We have infinitely greater things before us; and if theſe gain their due ſhare of our attention, this ſubject of grammatical criticiſm will be almoſt nothing. The noiſe that is made about it, is one of the greateſt marks of the frivoliſm of many readers, and writers too of the preſent age.

Not

Not that I think the buſineſs of language, and of grammar is a matter of no importance, even to a philoſopher. It is, in my opinion, a matter of very conſiderable conſequence; but in another view. That I have, accordingly, given a good deal of attention to it, will, I hope, appear by a *Courſe of Lectures on the Theory of Language, and Univerſal Grammar*, which was printed ſome years ago for private uſe, and which I propoſe to correct, and make public. To the ſame treatiſe I muſt, likewiſe, refer my readers for the ſatisfaction I may be able to give them, with reſpect to the definitions of terms, and ſome other articles relating to Grammar, in which I differ from Mr. Harris, and other grammarians.

With reſpect to our own language, there ſeems to be a kind of claim upon all who make uſe of it to do ſomething for its improvement; and the beſt thing we can do for this purpoſe at preſent, is to exhibit its actual ſtructure, and the varieties with which it is uſed. When theſe are once diſtinctly pointed out, and generally attended to, the beſt forms of ſpeech, and thoſe which are moſt agreeable

able to the analogy of the language, will ſoon recommend themſelves, and come into general uſe; and when, by this means, the language ſhall be written with ſufficient uniformity, we may hope to ſee a complete grammar of it. At preſent, it is by no means ripe for ſuch a work; but we may approximate to it very faſt, if all perſons who are qualified to make remarks upon it, will give a little attention to the ſubject. In ſuch a caſe, a few years might be ſufficient to complete it. The progreſs of every branch of real ſcience ſeems to have been prodigiouſly accelerated of late. The preſent age may hope to ſee a new and capital æra in the hiſtory of every branch of uſeful knowledge; and I hope that the Engliſh language, which cannot fail to be the vehicle of a great part of it, will come in for ſome ſhare of improvement, and acquire a more fixed and eſtabliſhed character than it can boaſt at preſent.

But our grammarians appear to me to have acted precipitately in this buſineſs, and to have taken a wrong method of fixing our language. This will never be effected

effected by the arbitrary rules of any man, or body of men whatever; becauſe theſe ſuppoſe the language actually fixed already, contrary to the real ſtate of it: whereas a language can never be properly fixed, till all the varieties with which it is uſed, have been held forth to public view, and the general preference of certain forms have been declared, by the general practice afterwards. Whenever I have mentioned any variety in the grammatical forms that are uſed to expreſs the ſame thing, I have ſeldom ſcrupled to ſay which of them I prefer; but this is to be underſtood as nothing more than a conjecture, which time muſt confirm or refute.

A circumſtance which may give us hopes to ſee the ſpeedy accompliſhment of the deſign of completing the grammar of our language, is the exceeding great ſimplicity of its ſtructure, ariſing, chiefly, from the paucity of our inflections of words. For this we are, perhaps, in ſome meaſure, indebted to the long-continued barbariſm of the people from whom we received it. The words we afterwards borrowed from foreign languages,

guages, though they now make more than one half of the ſubſtance of ours, were like more plentiful nouriſhment to a meagre body, that was grown to its full ſtature, and become too rigid to admit of any new modification of its parts. They have added conſiderable to the bulk and gracefulneſs of our language; but have made no alteration in the ſimplicity of its original form.

Grammar may be compared to a treatiſe of *Natural Philoſophy*; the one conſiſting of obſervations on the various changes, combinations, and mutual affections of words; and the other on thoſe of the parts of nature; and were the language of men as uniform as the works of nature, the *grammar of language* would be as indiſputable in its principles as the *grammar of nature*. But ſince good authors have adopted different forms of ſpeech, and in a caſe which admits of no ſtandard but that of *cuſtom*, one authority may be of as much weight as another; the *analogy of language* is the only thing to which we can have recourſe to adjuſt theſe differences. For language, to anſwer the intent of it, which is to expreſs our

our thoughts with certainty in an intercourſe with one another, muſt be fixed and conſiſtent with itſelf.

By an attention to theſe maxims hath this grammatical performance been conducted. The beſt and the moſt numerous authorities have been carefully followed. Where they have been contradictory, recourſe hath been had to analogy, as the laſt reſourſe. If this ſhould decide for neither of two contrary practices, the thing muſt remain undecided, till *all-governing cuſtom* ſhall declare in favour of the one or the other.

As to a public *Academy*, inveſted with authority to aſcertain the uſe of words, which is a project that ſome perſons are very ſanguine in their expectations from, I think it not only unſuitable to the genius of a *free nation*, but in itſelf ill calculated to reform and fix a language. We need make no doubt but that the beſt forms of ſpeech will, in time, eſtabliſh themſelves by their own ſuperior excellence: and, in all controverſies, it is better to wait the deciſions of *Time*, which are ſlow and ſure, than to take thoſe of *Synods*, which

which are often haſty and injudicious. A *manufacture* for which there is a great demand, and a *language* which many perſons have leiſure to read and write, are both ſure to be brought, in time, to all the perfection of which they are capable. What would *Academies* have contributed to the perfection of the *Greek* and *Latin* languages? Or who, in thoſe free ſtates, would have ſubmitted to them?

The propriety of introducing the *Engliſh grammar* into *Engliſh ſchools*, cannot be diſputed; a competent knowledge of our own language being both uſeful and ornamental in every profeſſion, and a critical knowledge of it abſolutely neceſſary to all perſons of a liberal education. The little difficulty there is apprehended to be in the ſtudy of it, is the chief reaſon, I believe, why it hath been ſo much neglected. The *Latin* was ſo complex a language that it made, of neceſſity (notwithſtanding the *Greek* was the learned tongue at Rome) a conſiderable branch of Roman ſchool education: whereas ours, by being more ſimple, is, perhaps, leſs generally underſtood. And though the *Grammar-ſchool* be, on all accounts, the moſt proper place

place for learning it; how many Grammar-ſchools have we, and of no ſmall reputation, which are deſtitute of all proviſion for the regular teaching of it? All the ſkill that our youth at ſchool have in it, being acquired in an indirect manner; *viz.* by the mere practice of uſing it in verbal tranſlations.

Indeed, it is not much above a century ago, that our native tongue ſeemed to be looked upon as below the notice of a claſſical ſcholar; and men of learning made very little uſe of it, either in converſation or in writing. And even ſince it hath been made the vehicle of knowledge of all kinds, it hath not found its way into the ſchools appropriated to language, in proportion to its growing importance; moſt of my cotemporaries, I believe, being ſenſible, that their knowledge of the grammar of their mother tongue hath been acquired by their own ſtudy and obſervation, ſince they have paſſed the rudiments of the ſchools.

To obviate this inconvenience, we muſt introduce into our ſchools *Engliſh grammar*, *Engliſh compoſitions*, and frequent *Engliſh* *tranſ-*

tranſlations from authors in other languages. The common objection to Engliſh compoſitions, that it is like requiring brick to be made without ſtraw, (boys not being ſuppoſed to be capable of ſo much reflection, as is neceſſary to treat any ſubject with propriety) is a very frivolous one: ſince it is very eaſy to contrive a variety of exerciſes introductory to *Themes* upon moral and ſcientifical ſubjects; in many of which the whole attention may be employed upon language only; and from thence youth may be led on in a regular ſeries of compoſitions, in which the tranſition from *language* to *ſentiment* may be as gradual and eaſy as poſſible.

An appendix would have been made to this grammar of examples of *bad Engliſh*; for they are really uſeful; but that they make ſo uncouth an appearance in print. And it can be no manner of trouble to any teacher to ſupply the want of them, by a falſe reading of any good author, and requiring his pupils to point out, and rectify his miſtakes. If any of the *additional obſervations* be uſed in ſchools, it will be ſufficient for the maſter to read the

the paſſages as he finds them, and to require of his pupils the proper corrections, and the reaſons alledged for them.

I muſt not conclude this preface, without making my acknowledgments to Dr. *Johnſon*, whoſe admirable dictionary has been of the greateſt uſe to me in the ſtudy of our language. It is pity he had not formed as juſt, and as extenſive an idea of Engliſh grammar. Perhaps this very uſeful work may ſtill be reſerved for his diſtinguiſhed abilities in this way.

I muſt, alſo, acknowledge my obligation to Dr. *Lowth*, whoſe *ſhort introduction to Engliſh grammar* was firſt publiſhed about a month after the former edition of mine. Though our plans, definitions of terms, and opinions, differ very conſiderably, I have taken a few of his examples (though generally for a purpoſe different from his) to make my own more complete. He, or any other perſon, is welcome to make the ſame uſe of thoſe which I have collected. It is from an amicable union of labours, together with a generous emulation in all the friends of ſcience, that we

we may moſt reaſonably expect the extenſion of all kinds of knowledge.

The candid critic will, I hope, excuſe, and point out to me, any miſtakes he may think I have fallen into in this performance. In ſuch a number of obſervations, moſt of them (with reſpect to myſelf, at leaſt) original, it would be very extraordinary, if none ſhould prove haſty or injudicious.

THE

THE RUDIMENTS OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

The General Distribution.

LANGUAGE is a method of conveying our ideas to the minds of other perſons; and the *grammar* of any language is a collection of obſervations on the ſtructure of it, and a ſyſtem of rules for the proper uſe of it.

Every language conſiſts of a number of words, and words conſiſt of letters.

In the Engliſh language, the following twenty-ſix letters are made uſe of; A, a; B, b; C, c; D, d; E, e; F, f; G, g; H, h; I, i; J, j; K, k; L, l; M, m; N, n; O, o; P, p; Q, q; R, r; S, ſ; T, t; U, u; V, v; W, w; X, x; Y, y; Z, z.

Five of these letters, viz. *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, are called *vowels*, and are capable of being distinctly sounded by themselves. *Y* is also sometimes used as a vowel, having the same sound as *i*. The conjunction of two vowels makes a *diphthong*, and of three a *triphthong*.

The rest of the letters are called *consonants*, being sounded in conjunction with vowels. Of these, however, *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *f*, *s*, are called *semi-vowels*, giving an imperfect sound without the help of a vowel; and *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, are, moreover, called *liquids*. But *b*, *c*, *d*, *g*, *k*, *p*, *q*, *t*, are called *mutes*, yielding no sound at all without the help of a vowel.

Any number of letters, which together give a distinct sound, make a *syllable*, and several syllables are generally used to compose a word.

Having given this view of the constituent parts of the English language, I shall consider the Grammar of it under the following heads:

I. Of the inflections of words.

II. Of the grammatical use and signification of certain words; especially such as the paucity of inflections obliges us to make use of, in order to express what, in other languages, is

is effected by a change of termination, &c.

III. Of Syntax, compriſing the order of words in a ſentence, and the correſpondence of one word to another.

IV. Of Proſody, or the rules of verſification.

V. Of grammatical figures.

I ſhall adopt the uſual diſtribution of words into eight claſſes, viz.

NOUNS, ADJECTIVES, PRONOUNS, VERBS, ADVERBS, PREPOSITIONS, CONJUNCTIONS, and INTERJECTIONS.

I do this in compliance with the practice of moſt *Grammarians*; and becauſe, if any number in a thing ſo arbitrary, muſt be fixed upon, this ſeems to be as comprehenſive and diſtinct as any. All the innovation I have made hath been to throw out the *Participle*, and ſubſtitute the *Adjective*, as more evidently a diſtinct part of ſpeech.

PART I.

Of the Inflections of Words.

SECTION I.

Of the Inflections of Nouns.

Q. WHAT is a NOUN?

A. A NOUN or (as it is ſometimes called) a SUBSTANTIVE, is the name of any thing; as *a Horſe, a Tree; John, Thomas.*

Q. How many kind of nouns are there?

A. Two; PROPER and COMMON.

Q. Which are nouns, or ſubſtantives COMMON?

A. Such as denote the kinds or ſpecies of things; as *a Man, a Horſe, a River*; which may be underſtood of any man, any horſe, or any river.

Q. Which are called nouns, or ſubſtantives, PROPER?

A. Such as denote the individuals of any ſpecies; as *John, Sarah, the Severn; London.*

Q. What changes of termination do nouns admit of?

A. The

A. The terminations of nouns are changed on two accounts principally; NUMBER, and CASE; and ſometimes alſo on account of GENDER.

Q. How many NUMBERS are there? and what is meant by NUMBER?

A. There are two Numbers; the SINGULAR, when one only is meant; and the PLURAL, when more are intended.

Q. How is the plural number formed?

A. The plural number is formed by adding [*s*] to the ſingular; as *River, Rivers*; *Table, Tables*: Or [*es*] where [*s*] could not otherwiſe be ſounded; viz. after [*ch*] [*s*] [*ſh*] [*x*] and [z] as *Fox, Foxes*; *Church, Churches*.

Q. What *exceptions* are there to this general rule?

A. There are two principal exceptions to this rule. 1. The plural of ſome nouns ends in [*en*] as *Ox, Oxen*. 2. When the ſingular ends in [*f*] or [*fe*] the plural uſually ends in [*ves*] as *Calf, Calves*; *Wife, Wives*. Though there are ſome few of theſe terminations that follow the general rule; as *Muff, Muffs*; *Chief, Chiefs*.

Q. Suppoſe a noun end in [*y*].

A. In the plural number it is changed into *ies*; as *Fairy, Fairies*; *Gallery, Galleries*.

Q. Are there no other irregularities in the formation of numbers, beſides thoſe that are taken notice of in theſe exceptions?

A. There are ſeveral plural terminations that can be reduced to no rule; of which are the following, *Die*, *Dice*; *Gooſe*, *Geeſe*; *Foot*, *Feet*; *Tooth*, *Teeth*.

Q. Is the plural termination always different from the ſingular?

A. No. They are ſometimes the very ſame; as in the words *Sheep*, *Deer*, *&c.*

Q. Have all nouns a ſingular termination?

A. No. Some nouns have only a plural termination in uſe; as *Aſhes*, *Bellows*, *Lungs*.

Q. What are the CASES of nouns?

A. CASES are thoſe changes in the terminations of nouns, which ſerve to expreſs their relation to other words.

Q. How many caſes are there?

A. There are two caſes; the NOMINATIVE and the GENITIVE.

Q. What is the *Nominative* caſe?

A. The *Nominative* caſe is that in which we barely name a thing; as *a Man*, *a Horſe*.

Q. What is the GENITIVE caſe?

A. The GENITIVE caſe is that which denotes property or poſſeſſion; and is formed by adding [*s*] with an apoſtrophe before it to the nominative; as *Solomon's wiſdom*; *The Men's wit*; *Venus's beauty*; or the apoſtrophe only in the plural number, when the nominative ends in [*s*] as the *Stationers' arms*.

Q. Is

Q. Is the relation of property or poſſeſſion always expreſſed by a genitive caſe?

A. No. It is likewiſe expreſſed by the particle [*of*] before the word; as *the wiſdom of Solomon*; *the beauty of Venus*; *the arms of the Stationers*.

Q. How many GENDERS are there? and what is meant by *Gender*?

A. There are two GENDERS; the MASCULINE, to denote the male kind, and the FEMININE, to denote the female.

Q. By what change of termination is the diſtinction of gender expreſſed?

A. The diſtinction of gender (when it is expreſſed by a change of determination) is made by adding [*eſs*] to the maſculine to make it feminine; as *Lion*, *Lioneſs*; *Heir*, *Heireſs*.

SECTION II.

Of the Inflections of Adjectives.

Q. WHAT are ADJECTIVES?

A. ADJECTIVES are words that denote the properties or qualities of things; as, *good*, *tall*, *ſwift*.

Q. On what account do adjectives change their terminations?

A. Adjectives change their terminations on account of COMPARISON only.

Q. How many degrees of compariſon are there?

A. There are three degrees of comparison; the POSITIVE, in which the quality is barely mentioned; as *hard*: the COMPARATIVE, which expreſſes the quality ſomewhat increaſed, and is formed by adding [*r*] or [*er*] to the poſitive; as *harder*; and the SUPERLATIVE, which expreſſeth the higheſt degree of the quality, by adding [*ſt*] or [*eſt*] to the poſitive; as *hardeſt*.

Q. Are all adjectives compared in this manner?

A. No. Some adjectives are compared very irregularly; as the following:

Poſ.	Comp.	Sup.
Good,	*Better*,	*Beſt*,
Bad,	*Worſe*,	*Worſt*,
Little,	*Leſs*,	*Leaſt*,
Much,	*More*,	*Moſt*,
Near,	*Nearer*,	*Neareſt* or *next*,
Late,	*Later*,	*Lateſt* or *laſt*.

Q. Are the degrees of compariſon always expreſſed by a change of termination?

A. No. Some adjectives, and eſpecially *Polyſyllables*, to avoid a harſhneſs in the pronunciation, are compared, not by change of termination, but by particles prefixed; as *benevolent*, *more benevolent*, *moſt benevolent*.

SECTION

SECTION III.

Of the Inflections of Pronouns.

Q. WHAT are PRONOUNS?

A. PRONOUNS are words that are uſed as ſubſtitutes for nouns, to prevent the too frequent and tireſome repetition of them; as *He did this or that*, inſtead of expreſsly naming the perſon doing, and the thing done, every time there is occaſion to ſpeak of them.

Q. How many kinds of pronouns are there?

A. There are four kinds of pronouns; PERSONAL, POSSESSIVE, RELATIVE, and DEMONSTRATIVE.

Q. Have not ſome pronouns a caſe peculiar to themſelves?

A. Yes. It is generally called the OBLIQUE caſe; and is uſed after moſt verbs and prepoſitions.

Q. Which are the PERSONAL pronouns?

A. The PERSONAL pronouns are *I, thou, he, ſhe, it*, with their plurals.

Q. How are the perſonal pronouns formed?

A. Very irregularly, in the following manner;

	Sing.	Plural.
Nominative.	*I*,	*We*.
Oblique caſe.	*Me*,	*Us*.
Nominative.	*Thou*,	*Ye*.
Oblique caſe.	*Thee*.	*You*.
Nominative.	*He*. *She*.	*They*.
Oblique caſe.	*Him*. *Her*.	*Them*.
Nominative.	*It*.	*They*.
Oblique caſe.	*It*.	*Them*.
Genitive.	*Its*.	——

Q. Which are the pronouns POSSESSIVE?

A. The pronouns POSSESSIVE are, *my*, *our*, *thy*, *your*, *his*, *her*, *their*.

Q. How are the pronouns poſſeſſive declined?

A. Pronouns poſſeſſive, being wholly of the nature of adjectives, are like them indeclinable; except that when they are uſed without their ſubſtantives *my* becomes *mine*; *thy*, *thine*; *our*, *ours*; *your*, *yours*; *her*, *hers*; *their*, *theirs*; as *This book is mine: This is not yours, but theirs.*

Q. Which are the RELATIVE pronouns?

A. The RELATIVE pronouns (ſo called becauſe they refer, or relate to an antecedent or ſubſequent ſubſtantive) are *who*, *which*, *who*, and *whether*.

Q. How is *who* declined?

A.

A. Sing. and plural.

Nominative.	*Who.*
Genitive.	*Whoſe.*
Oblique.	*Whom.*

Q. Are *which*, *what*, and *whether* declinable?

A. No. Except *whoſe*, may be ſaid to be the genitive of *which*.

Q. What is meant by the ANTECEDENT of a relative?

A. That preceding noun to which it is relative, as an adjective is to its ſubſtantive; as the word *Darius*, when we ſay, *This is Darius whom Alexander conquered.*

Q. Which are the pronouns DEMONSTRATIVE?

A. The pronouns DEMONSTRATIVE, are, *this*, *that*, *other*, and *the ſame*.

Q. How are the demonſtrative pronouns declined?

A. *This* makes *theſe*, and *that* makes *thoſe* in the plural number, and *other* makes *others* when it is found without its ſubſtantive.

SECTION IV.

Of the Inflection of Verbs.

Q. WHAT is a VERB?

A. A Verb is a word that expreſſeth what is affirmed of, or attributed to a thing; as *I love*; *the horſe neighs.*

Q. What

Q. What is meant by the SUBJECT of an affirmation.

A. The perſon or thing concerning which the affirmation is made. When we ſay, *Alexander conquered Darius*, Alexander is the ſubject; becauſe we affirm concerning him, that he conquered Darius.

Q. How many kinds of verbs are there?

A. Two; TRANSITIVE and NEUTER.

Q. What is a verb tranſitive?

A. A verb tranſitive, beſides having a ſubject, implies, likewiſe an object of the affirmation, upon which its meaning may, as it were, paſs; and without which the ſenſe would not be complete. The verb *to conquer* is tranſitive, becauſe it implies an object, that is, a perſon, or kingdom, &c. conquered; and *Darius* is that object, when we ſay, *Alexander conquered Darius.*

Q. What is a verb NEUTER?

A. A verb neuter has no object different from the ſubject of the affirmation; as *to reſt.* When we ſay *Alexander reſteth*, the ſenſe is complete, without any other words.

Q. What is the RADICAL FORM of verbs, or that from which all other forms and modifications of them are derived?

A. The RADICAL FORM of verbs is that in which they follow the particle *to*; as *to love.*

Q. What

Q. What circumſtances affect the determination of verbs?

A. Two. TENSE and PERSON; beſides NUMBER, which they have in common with nouns.

Q. How many TENSES have verbs?

A. Verbs have two TENSES; the PRESENT TENSE, denoting the *time preſent*; and the PRETER TENSE, which expreſſeth the *time paſt*.

Q. What changes of termination do theſe *tenſes* of verbs occaſion?

A. The firſt perſon of the preter tenſe is generally formed by adding [*ed*] or [*d*] to the firſt perſon of the preſent tenſe (which is the ſame as the radical form of the verb) as *I love, I loved.* But many verbs form their preter tenſe without regard to any rule or analogy; as *to awake, I awoke, to think, I thought.*

Q. What changes of termination are occaſioned by the *perſons* of verbs?

A. In both tenſes, the ſecond perſon ſingular adds [*ſt*] or [*eſt*] to the firſt perſon (which, in the third perſon ſingular of the preſent tenſe, changes into [*eth*] or [*eſt*] all the perſons of the plural number retaining the termination of the firſt perſon ſingular.

Q. Give an example of a verb formed in its tenſes and perſons.

A.

A. Preſent Tenſe.

Singular.	Plural.
I love.	*We love.*
Thou loveſt.	*Ye love.*
He loveth, or *loves.*	*They love.*

Preter Tenſe.

I loved.	*We loved.*
Thou lovedſt.	*Ye loved.*
He loved.	*They loved.*

Preſent Tenſe.

I grant.	*We grant.*
Thou granteſt.	*Ye grant.*
He granteth or *grants.*	*They grant.*

Preter Tenſe.

I granted.	*We granted.*
Thou grantedſt.	*Ye granted.*
He granted.	*They granted.*

Q. Are theſe changes of termination in the perſons of verbs always obſerved?

A. No. They are generally omitted after the words, *if*, *though*, *e'er*, *before*, *whether*, *except*, *whatſoever*, *whomſoever*, and words of *wiſhing*: as *Doubtleſs thou art our father*, *though Abraham* acknowledge *us not*, [not *acknowledgeth*].

Q. What is this form of the tenſes called?

A. This form, becauſe it is rarely uſed but in conjunction with ſome or other of the preceding words, may be called the *conjunctive* form of the tenſes. It is as follows:

Conjunctive

Conjunctive Preſent.

Sing.	Plural.
If I love.	*If we love.*
If thou love.	*If ye love.*
If he love.	*If they love.*

Conjunctive Preter Tenſe.

If I love.	*If we loved.*
If thou loved.	*If ye loved.*
If he loved.	*If they loved.*

Q. What are the PARTICIPLES of verbs?

A. PARTICIPLES are adjectives derived from verbs, and retaining their ſignification.

Q. How many participles hath a verb?

A. A verb hath two participles. 1. The participle *Preſent*, which denotes that the action ſpoken of is then taking place, and ends in [*ing*] as *hearing*, *writing*. 2. The participle *Preterite*, which denotes its being paſt, and ends in [*ed*] being the ſame with the firſt perſon of the preter tenſe; as *loved*.

Q. Do all participles preterite end in [*ed*]?

A. No. There are many participles preterite, which neither end in [*ed*] nor take any other termination of the preter tenſe;

tenſe; as to *begin*. Preter, *I began*. Part. It is *begun*. To die, Preter, He *died*. Part. He is *dead*: moreover, ſome verbs have two participles preterite, which may be uſed indifferently; as to *load*; he is *loaded*; he is *laden*. To *ſow*; it is *ſowed*; it is *ſown*.

Q. In what ſenſe is a verb to be underſtood, when it occurs in its radical form?

A. It hath, then, the force of a command from the perſon ſpeaking to the perſon or perſons to whom it is addreſſed; as, *write*, i. e. *do thou*, or *do ye write*.

Q. What is the meaning of the RADICAL FORM of a verb preceded by the particle *to*?

A. It is then no more than the name of an action or ſtate; as, *to die* is common to all men; i. e. *death* is common to all men.

Q. What are AUXILIARY verbs?

A. AUXILIARY verbs are verbs that are uſed in conjunction with other verbs, to aſcertain the time, and other circumſtances of an action with greater exactneſs.

Q. Which are the principal auxiliary verbs?

A. The principal auxiliary verbs are *to do*, *to have*, *to be*, and the imperfect verbs, *ſhall*, *will*, *can*, *may*, and *muſt*.

Q. How are theſe verbs inflected?

A. They are all inflected with conſiderable irregularity; and the verbs *ſhall*, *will*, *can*, and *may*, expreſs no certain diſtinction

on of time; and, therefore, have no proper tenſes: but they have two forms, one of which expreſſes abſolute certainty, and may, therefore, be called the *abſolute form*; and the other implies a condition, and may, therefore, be called the *conditional form*.

Q. What are the inflections of the verbs *to do*, *to have*, and *to be*?

To *Do*.

Preſent Tenſe.

Sing.	Plural.
I do.	*We do.*
Thou doeſt, or *doſt.*	*Ye do.*
He doth, or *does.*	*They do.*

(a) Preter Tenſe.

I did.	*We did.*
Thou didſt.	*Ye did.*
He did.	*They did.*

Participles.

Preſent.	*Doing.*
Preterite.	*Done.*

To

(a) After each tenſe may be ſubjoined the *conjunctive form* of it; as, *If I do, if thou do. If I did, if thou did*, &c.

To *Have*.

Preſent Tenſe.

I have,	*We have.*
Thou haſt,	*Ye have.*
He hath, or *has.*	*They have.*

Preter Tenſe.

Sing.	Plural.
I had.	*We had.*
Thou hadſt.	*Ye had.*
He had.	*They had.*

Participles.

Preſent. *Having.*
Preter. *Had.*

To *Be*.

Preſent Tenſe.

I am.	*We are.*
Thou art.	*Ye are.*
He is.	*They are.*

Conjunctive form of the preſent Tenſe.

If

If I be.	*If we be.*
If thou be (b)	*If ye be.*
If he be.	*If they be.*

Preter Tenſe.

I was.	*We were.*
Thou waſt.	*Ye were.*
He was.	*They were.*

Conjunctive Form.

If I were.	*If we were.*
If thou wert.	*If ye were.*
If he were.	*If they were.*

Participles.

Preſent.	*Being.*
Preter.	*Been.*

Q. What are the inflections of the verbs *ſhall*, *will*, *may*, *can*, and *muſt*?

A. *Shall.*

Absolute Form.

Sing.	Plural.
I ſhall.	*We ſhall.*
Thou ſhalt.	*Ye ſhall.*
He ſhall.	*They ſhall.*

Condi-

(b) Mr. *Johnſon* ſays *beeſt.*

CONDITIONAL Form.

I ſhould.	*We ſhould.*
Thou ſhouldeſt.	*Ye ſhould.*
He ſhould.	*They ſhould.*

Will.

ABSOLUTE Form.

I Will.	*We will.*
Thou wilt.	*Ye will.*
He will.	*They will.*

CONDITIONAL Form.

I would.	*We would.*
Thou wouldeſt.	*Ye would.*
He would.	*They would.*

May.

ABSOLUTE Form.

Sing.	Plural.
I may.	*We may.*
Thou mayeſt.	*Ye may.*
He may.	*They may.*

CONDITIONAL. Form.

I might.	*We might.*
Thou mighteſt.	*Ye might.*
He might.	*They might.*

Can.

Can.

ABSOLUTE Form.

I can.	*We can.*
Thou canſt.	*Ye can.*
He can.	*They can.*

CONDITIONAL Form.

I could.	*We could.*
Thou couldeſt.	*Ye could.*
He could.	*They could.*

Muſt.

Preſent Tenſe.

I muſt.	*We muſt*
Thou muſt.	*Ye muſt.*
He muſt.	*They muſt.*

Q. What are the COMPOUND TENSES of verbs?

A. The COMPOUND TENSES of verbs are the tenſes of auxiliary verbs uſed in conjunction with ſome form, or participle of other verbs; as *I ſhall hear, I may have heard.*

Q. In what manner are the auxiliary verbs uſed in conjunction with other verbs?

A. To the ſeveral tenſes of the auxiliary verb *to have*, is joined the *participle preterite*,

rite, as *I have written, I have been.* To those of the verb *to be*, are joined both the participles; the *present* and *preterite:* as *I am hearing*, and *I am heard*; and to all the rest of the auxiliary verbs is joined the *radical form* of the verb; as *I shall, will, may, must, can*, or *do write*; *I shall, will, may, must* or *can be.*

Q. Into how many *classes*, or *orders*, may the compound tenses of verbs be distributed?

A. The compound tenses of verbs may be commodiously distributed into three distinct classes or orders; according as the auxiliary verbs that constitute them require the *radical form*, the *participle present*, or the *participle preterite* to be joined with them. They are likewise *single*, *double* or *triple*, according as *one*, *two*, or *three* auxiliary verbs are made use of.

Q. Repeat the compound tenses of the verb *to hear.*

A. The compound tenses of the *first order*, or those in which the *radical form* of the principal verb is made use of,

	Will, can, may, must or *shall hear.*
Absolute form.	*I shall hear, Thou shalt hear, He shall hear*, &c.
Conditional.	*I should hear, Thou shouldest hear, He should hear*, &c. (d)

(b) In the same manner form the tenses made by *will, can, may*, and *must*. The conjunctive form of the tenses may likewise be supplied in its proper place, if it be thought necessary.

The

The compound tenſes of the *ſecond order*, or thoſe in which the participle preſent is made uſe of.

To be hearing.

Preſent tenſe.	*I am hearing, thou art hearing,* &c.
Conjunctive form.	*If I be hearing, If thou be hearing,* &c.
Preterite.	*I was hearing, Thou waſt hearing,* &c.
Conjunctive.	*If I were hearing, If thou wert hearing,* &c.

Participle preſent. *Being hearing.*
Participle preterite. *Been hearing.*

The firſt Double Compound.

Shall be hearing.

Abſolute form.	*I ſhall be hearing, Thou ſhalt be hearing,* &c.
Conditional.	*I ſhould be hearing, Thou ſhouldeſt be hearing,* &c.

The ſecond Double Compound.

To have been hearing.

Preſent tenſe	*I have been hearing, Thou haſt been hearing,* &c.
Preterite.	*I had been hearing, Thou hadſt been hearing,* &c.

Participle preſent. *Having been hearing.*

The Triple Compound.

Shall have been hearing.

Abſolute form.	*I ſhall have been hearing, Thou ſhalt have*, &c.
Conditional.	*I ſhould have been hearing, Thou ſhouldeſt have*, &c.

The compound tenſes of the *third order*; viz. thoſe in which the participle preterite of the principal verb is uſed.

To be heard.

Preſent tenſe.	*I am heard, Thou art heard*, &c.
Conjunctive form.	*If I be heard, If thou be heard*, &c.
Preterite.	*I was heard, thou waſt heard*, &c.
Conjunctive.	*If I were heard, if thou were heard*, &c.

Participle preſent. *Being heard.*
—— preterite. *Been heard.*

The firſt Double Compound.

Shall be heard.

Abſolute form.	*I ſhall be heard, Thou ſhalt be heard*, &c.
Conditional.	*I ſhould be heard, thou ſhouldeſt*, &c.

The

The ſecond Double Compound.

Shall have, heard.

Abſolute form.	*I ſhall have heard, Thou ſhalt have,* &c.
Conditional.	*I ſhould have heard, Thou ſhouldeſt,* &c.

The third Double Compound.

To have been heard.

Preſent tenſe.	*I have been heard, Thou haſt been heard,* &c.
Preterite.	*I had been heard, Thou hadſt been heard,* &c.

Participle preſent. *Having been heard.*

The Triple Compound.

Shall have been heard.

Abſolute form.	*I ſhall have been heard, Thou,* &c.
Conditional.	*I ſhould have been heard, Thou ſhouldeſt,* &c.

Q. What do you obſerve concerning theſe compound tenſes?

A. It is obſervable, that, in forming the tenſes, all the change of termination is confined to the auxiliary that is named firſt; and therefore, ſecondly, That if the auxiliary which is firſt named, have no

participle, there is no participle belonging to the tenſes that are made by it.

To this ſection concerning the inflections of words, it may be convenient to ſubjoin an account of thoſe claſſes which admit of few, or no inflections.

Q. What are ADVERBS?

A. ADVERBS are contractions of ſentences, or of clauſes of a ſentence, generally ſerving to denote the *manner*, and other *circumſtances* of an action; as *wiſely*, i. e. in a wiſe manner; *now*, i. e. at this time; *here*, in this place.

Q. How many kinds of adverbs are there?

A. Adverbs may be diſtributed into as many kinds as there are circumſtances of an action. They may, therefore, be referred to a great variety of heads. The principal of them are the three following, *viz.* 1ſt, Thoſe of *Place*; as *here*, *there*. 2dly, Thoſe of *Time*; as *often*, *ſometimes*, *preſently*. And, 3dly, Thoſe of *Quality or Manner*, which are derived from adjectives by adding [*ly*] to them; as, *wiſely*, *happily*, *firſtly*; from *wiſe*, *happy*, *firſt*.

Q. What is a PREPOSITION?

A. A PREPOSITION is a word that expreſſeth the relation, that one word hath to another; ſuch as *of*, *with*, *from*, *to*: as,

He

He bought it with *money*, *He went* to *London*.

Q. What are CONJUNCTIONS?

A. CONJUNCTIONS are words that join ſentences together, and ſhew the manner of their dependence upon one another; as *and*, *if*, *but*, &c.

Q. What are INTERJECTIONS?

A. INTERJECTIONS are broken or imperfect words, denoting ſome emotion or paſſion of the mind; as, *ah*, *oh*, *phy*.

It may not be improper, alſo, to lay down, in this place, for the uſe of learners, *Eaſy rules to diſtinguiſh the ſeveral parts of ſpeech*.

A *Subſtantive* admits of [*a*] [*the*] *good*, *bad*, or ſome other known adjective before it; as, a good *man*.

An *Adjective* hath no determinate meaning with only [*a*] or [*the*] before it, but requires *man* or *thing* after it; and admits of degrees of compariſon; as a *good* man, a *better* man.

A *Verb* admits of the perſonal pronouns before it, as *He loves*, *They love*.

Pronouns have been enumerated.

Adverbs do all, or moſt of them, anſwer to ſome one of theſe queſtions, *How? How much? When?* or *Where?* when the anſwer gives no word that is known, by

the preceding rules, to be a ſubſtantive or adjective.

Prepoſitions eaſily admit the oblique caſes of the perſonal pronouns, *me*, *him*, *her*, *&c.* to follow them; as *to me*, *with me*, *among them*.

Conjunctions and *Interjections* are eaſily known by their definitions.

SECTION V.

Of the Derivation and Compoſition of Words.

BEſides the conſtant and regular inflections of words, of which an account has been given in the preceding ſections; there are many other changes, by means of which words paſs from one claſs to another: but, becauſe only ſome of the words of any claſs admit of a ſimilar change, they are not uſually enumerated among the grammatical changes of terminations. In nothing, however, is the genius of a language more apparent than in ſuch changes; and, were they uniform and conſtant, they would have the ſame right to be taken notice of by grammarians, that any other inflections have. Of theſe changes I ſhall here give the following

lowing ſhort ſummary, extracted chiefly from Dr. Johnſon.

Nouns are frequently converted into *verbs* by lengthening the ſound of their vowels; as *to houſe, to braze, to glaze, to breathe*; from *houſe, braſs, glaſs, breath.*

Som times nouns are elegantly converted into verbs without any change at all. *Cuſhioned*, Bolingbroke. *Diademed*, Pope. *Ribboned*, Lady M. W. Montague.

Verbs, with little or no variation, are converted into *ſubſtantives*, expreſſing what is denoted by the verb as done or procured; as *love*, a *fright*; from *to love, to fright*; and a *ſtroke*, from *ſtruck*, the preterite of the verb *to ſtrike.*

Beſides theſe, words of the following terminations are generally derivative; *nouns* ending in

—*er*, derived from *verbs*, ſignify the *agent*; as *lover, writer, ſtriker.*

Some nouns of this claſs, in conſequence of frequent uſe, have ceaſed to be conſidered as belonging to it; and in this caſe the *e* is often changed into ſome other vowel, as *liar, conductor.*

—*ing*, ſignify the *action* of the verb they are derived from; as *the frighting, the ſtriking.*

—*th*, are *abſtract ſubſtantives* derived from *concrete adjectives*; *as length, ſtrength, dearth*; from *long, ſtrong, dear*.

—*neſs*, —*hood*, or —*head*, } denote *character* or *quality*; as *whiteneſs, hardneſs, manhood, widowhood, godhead.*

—*ſhip*, ſignify *office, employment, ſtate*, or *condition*; as *kingſhip, ſtewardſhip.*

—*ery*, action or habit; as *knavery, foolery, roguery.*

—*wick*, —*rick*, —*ry*, —*dom*, } juriſdiction; as, *bailiwick, biſhoprick, deanry, kingdom.*

—*ian*, profeſſion; as, *theologian, phyſician,*

—*ard*, character or habit; as, *drunkard, dotard, dullard*

—*ment* and —*age*, } are derived from the French, and generally ſignify the *act* or the *habit*; as *commandment, uſage.*

—*ée*, the profeſſor (of French original as, *grantée*, one to whom a grant is made; *leſſée*, to whom the leaſe is made, *&c.*

Nouns ſometimes become *diminutives* by the addition of [*in*] or ſome other production of their termination; as *goſlin, lambkin, hillock, pickerel, rivulet.*

Adjectives, ending in

—*y*, and

—*y* and } are generally derived from *nouns*, and ſignify *plenty* and *abundance*, as *louſy*, *airy*, *joyful*, *fruitful*.

—*ſome* (q. d. *ſomething*; i. e. *in ſome degree*) ſignify likewiſe *plenty*, but in a leſs degree than the terminations [*y*] and [*full*] as *gameſome*, *loneſome*.

—*leſs*, ſignify *want*, as, *worthleſs*, *joyleſs*.

—*ly*, (q. d. *like*) ſignify *likeneſs*; as *giantly*, *heavenly*.

—*iſh*, ſignify *ſimilitude* or tendency to a character; as *whitiſh*, *thieviſh*, *childiſh*; alſo belonging to a nation; as *Daniſh*, *Spaniſh*, *Iriſh*.

—*able*, derived from nouns or verbs, ſignify *capacity*; as *comfortable*, *tenable*, *improveable*.

Verbs ending in

—*en* are frequently derived from adjectives, and ſignify the production of the quality; as *to lengthen*, *to ſtrengthen*.

The participles prefixed to words, with their uſe in compoſition, are the following:

Ante—ſignifies *before*; as *Antediluvian*.

Anti—and *Contra* } *againſt*; as *Antimonarchical*, *contradict*.

Circum—*about*; as *depoſe*, *circumſcribe*.

De—*down*; as *depoſe*, *depreciate*.

Dis—negation, or privation; as *diſbelieve*, *diſlike*, *diſarm*.

In (changed ſometimes into [*im*] before [*m*] into [*il*] always before [*l*] into [*ir*] before [*r*] in words derived from the Latin, and into [*un*] in other words) ſignifies negation; as *unpleaſant*, *ineffectual*, *imperfect*, *illegitimate*, *irrefragable*.

Miſs—*error*; as *miſtake*, *miſrepreſent*.

Per—*through*; as *perſuade*, *perſiſt*.

Poſt—*after*; as *poſtpone*.

Preter—*beyond* (in power) as *preternatural*.

Ultra—*beyond* (in place *as Ultramontane*.

Inter—*among*; as *intermix*.

Tranſ—*over*; as *tranſfer*, *tranſlate*.

Re—*again*, or *backward*; as *revolve*, *rebound*.

Super—*above*; as *ſupernatural*.

Sub—*under*; as *ſubſcribe*.

PART II.

Of the grammatical Uſe and Signification of certain Words, eſpecially ſuch as the paucity of our inflections obliges us to make uſe of, in order to expreſs what, in other languages, is effected by change of termination.

SECTION I.

Of the Articles.

Q. WHAT are ARTICLES?

A. Articles are the words [*a*] and [*the*] placed before nouns, to aſcertain the extent of their ſignification.

Q. What is the uſe of the article [*a*]?

A. The article [*a*] before a conſonant but [*an*] before a vowel, intimates that one only of a ſpecies is meant, but not any one in particular, as *This is a good book*, *i. e.* One among the books that are good. Hence it is called the article *Indefinite*.

Q. What is the uſe of the article [*the*]

A. The article [*the*] limits the ſignification of a word to one or more of a ſpecies; as *This is the book*; *Theſe are the men*, *i. e.* this particular book, and theſe particular men. For this reaſon it is called the article *Definite*.

Q. In what ſenſe is a noun to be underſtood, when neither of theſe articles is prefixed to it?

A. Generally, in an unlimited ſenſe, expreſſing not one in general, or one in particular, but every individual that can be comprehended in the term, as, *Man* is born to trouble; i. e. whoever partakes of human nature, *all mankind*.

SECTION II.

Of the Uſe of the Auxiliary Verbs.

Q. IN what manner doth the auxiliary verb *to do* affect the ſignification of verbs?

A. It only renders the affirmation the more *emphatical*; as *I do love, I did hate*; i. e. *I love indeed, indeed I hated.*

Q. In what manner doth the auxiliary verb *to be* affect the ſignification of verbs?

A. The auxiliary verb *to be*, joined with the *participle preſent* of a verb, expreſſes the affirmation with the greater emphaſis and preciſion; as *I am writing*; i. e. *in the very action of writing*; and joined to the *participle preterite* of a verb, it ſignifies the ſuffering or receiving the action expreſſed, as *I am loved, I was hated.*

Q. What

Q. What is the uſe of the auxiliary verbs *ſhall* and *will*?

A. When we ſimply *foretel*, we uſe *ſhall* in the firſt perſon, and *will* in the reſt; as *I ſhall*, or *he will write*: but when we *promiſe*, *threaten*, or *engage*, we uſe *will* in the firſt perſon, and *ſhall* in the reſt; as *I will* or *he ſhall write*.

Q. In what manner do the auxiliary verbs *can*, *may*, and *muſt*, affect the ſignification of verbs?

A. In the *abſolute form*, the auxiliary verb, *can* ſignifies a preſent *power*; *may*, a *right*; and *muſt* a *neceſſity* to do ſomething that is not yet done; as *I can*, *may*, or *muſt*, *write*; and the *conditional forms could* and *might*, ſignify likewiſe, a *power* and *right* to do what is affirmed, but imply the intervention of ſome obſtacle or impediment, that prevents its taking place, as *I could*, or *might write*; i. e. if nothing hindered.—The like may alſo be obſerved of the *conditional forms* of *ſhall* and *will*.

Q. In what manner doth the auxiliary verb *to have* affect the ſignification of verbs?

A. The auxiliary verb *to have* ſignifies that what is affirmed is or was paſt; as *I have received*, *I had written*; i. e. the action of receiving is now paſt, and the action of writing was then over.

Q. In

Q. In what manner doth the auxiliary verb *to have* determine the time of any action?

A. When we make uſe of the auxiliary verb *to have*, we have no idea of any certain portion of time intervening between the time of the action and the time of ſpeaking of it; the time of the action being ſome period that extends to the preſent; as *I have this year*, or *this morning, written*; ſpoken in the ſame year, or the ſame morning: whereas, ſpeaking of any action done in a period of time that is wholly expired, we uſe the preter tenſe of the verb; as *laſt year*, or *yeſterday I wrote a letter*: intimating, that ſome certain portion of time is paſt between the time of the action, and the time of ſpeaking of it.

Q. Are there no other verbs, beſides thoſe which are called *auxiliary*, that are joined in conſtruction with other verbs, without being followed by the prepoſition *to*?

A. The verbs *bid, dare, read, make, ſee, hear, feel*, and alſo *act* are uſed in the ſame conſtruction; as, *He ſaw me write it. I heard him ſay it.*

One of the greateſt difficulties in the Engliſh language, relates to the ſubject of this part; as it conſiſts in the uſe of the conjunctive particles and prepoſitions particularly

particularly *of*, *to*, *for*, *with*, and *in*, with a few others. Indeed, there is nothing in which the practice of our beſt authors is more variable or capricious: but I thought it would be beſt to throw all the remarks I have made on this ſubject into the *Additional Obſervations*.

PART III.

Of Syntax, comprising the Order of Words in a Sentence, and the Correſpondence of one Word to another.

Q. WHAT is the uſual place for the ſubject of the affirmation in an affirmative ſentence?

A. Before the verb; as the word *Alexander* in the ſentence, *Alexander conquered Darius.*

Q. What is its place in an interrogative ſentence?

A. Between the auxiliary and the radical form of the principal verb; as, *Did Alexander conquer Darius?*

Q. What is the uſual place for the object of an Affirmation?

A. After the verb, as the word *Darius* in the ſentence, *Alexander conquered Darius.*

Q. What is the uſual place of the adjective?

A. Immediately before the ſubſtantive, as, *a good man, a fine horſe.*

Q. In what caſes is the adjective placed after the ſubſtantive?

A. When a clauſe of a ſentence depends upon the adjective; as, a man generous

nerous *to his enemies. Feed me with* food convenient *for me.*

Q. What is the proper place for the pronoun relative?

A. Immediately after its antecedent; as *That is the* Darius, whom *Alexander conquered.*

Q. What is the moſt convenient place for an adverb, or a ſeparate clauſe of a ſentence?

A. Between the ſubject and the verb; as, *Alexander* intirely *conquered Darius. Alexander in three battles, conquered Darius.* Or between the auxiliaries and the verb or participle; as, *You have preſently diſpatched this buſineſs, I have been exceedingly pleaſed.*

Q. What is the correſpondence of the adjective pronouns with their ſubſtantives?

A. They muſt agree in number; as, *This man. Theſe men.*

Q. What is the correſpondence of the verb and its ſubject?

A. They muſt have the ſame number, and perſon; as, *I love. Thou loveſt. He loves. The ſun ſhines, &c.*

Q. Suppoſe there be two ſubjects of the ſame affirmation, and they be both of the ſingular number?

A. The verb correſponding to them muſt

muſt be in the plural; as, *Your* youth *and* merit have *been abuſed.*

Q. In what circumſtances is the oblique caſe of pronouns uſed?

A. After verbs tranſitive, and prepoſitions; as, *He loves* her. *I gave the book to* him.

As but few of the relations of words and ſentences in conſtruction are expreſſed by a change of termination in Engliſh, but generally by conjunctive particles, the art of Engliſh Syntax muſt conſiſt, chiefly, in the proper application of the *conjunctive particles*; and the accurate uſe of theſe can only be learned from *obſervation* and a *dictionary.*

What I have obſerved on this ſubject will be found among the *Additional Obſervations.*

PART IV.

Of Proſody.

Q. WHAT is PROSODY?

A. PROSODY is that part of Grammar which teaches the rules of *Pronunciation*, and of *Verſification*.

Q. Wherein conſiſts the art of *Pronunciation?*

A. In laying the *accent* upon the proper ſyllable of a word, and the *emphaſis* upon the proper word of a ſentence.

Q. Upon what doth the art of *Verſification* depend?

A. Upon arranging the ſyllables of words according to certain laws, reſpecting *quantity* or *accent*.

Q. What is moſt obſervable in the arrangement of ſyllables according to their quantity?

A. If the accent fall upon the *firſt* ſyllable, the *third*, the *fifth*, &c. the verſe is ſaid to conſiſt of *Trochees*; which is called a foot of two ſyllables, whereof the firſt is long, and the ſecond ſhort.

If it fall upon the *ſecond*, the *fourth*, the *ſixth*, &c. as is moſt uſual in Engliſh verſe, it is ſaid to conſiſt of *Iambics*; which are feet of two ſyllables, whereof the firſt is ſhort, and the ſecond long.

If two ſyllables be pronounced both long, the foot is called a *ſpondee*; and if one long ſyllable be ſucceeded by two ſhort ones continually, the verſe is ſaid to conſiſt of *Dactyls*. I ſhall give a ſhort ſpecimen of each of theſe kinds of verſe.

Trochaical

In thĕ | dāys ŏf, | ōld,
Stōriĕs | plăinly | tōld,

(e) *Iambic.*

Wīth rā | vĭſh'd eārs
Thĕ mōn | ărch hēars.

Dactylic, ſometimes called *Anapæſtic.*

Dĭ | ōgĕnĕs | ſūrly ănd | prōud.

Verſes conſiſt of more or fewer of theſe feet at pleaſure; and verſes of different lengths intermixed form a *Pindarick* poem.

(e) A *Spondee*, with which Iambic verſes abound.

PART V.

Of Figures.

FIGURES are thoſe deviations from grammatical or natural propriety, which are either allowed or admired.

Thoſe which affect Engliſh *letters* or *ſyllables*, and which may therefore be termed *Orthographical* figures are *Aphæreſis*, when a ſyllable or letter is omitted at the beginning of a word; as *'tis*, for *it is*; *Syncope*, when it is left out in the middle; as *ne'er*, for *never*; and *Apocope*, when omitted at the end; as *tho'* for *though*.

The omiſſion of a word neceſſary to grammatical propriety, is called *Ellipſis*; as *I wiſh you would write*, for *I wiſh that you would write*.

Particles, and ſome other words, muſt frequently be ſupplied to make the conſtruction complete; as in the following ſentences. *I value it not a* (or *of a*) *farthing*; i. e. *at the price of a farthing*: *at twelve o'clock*; i. e. *of the clock*.

The pronoun relative is frequently omitted; as, *The houſe I have built*; inſtead of ſaying, *The houſe* that, or *which I have built*. To make very frequent uſe of this ellipſis ſeems to be a fault.

With reſpect to the *uſe of figures* it is obſerved, that the *orthographical figures* are not uſed with approbation, except in very *familiar writing*, or *verſe*.

AN

APPENDIX,

Containing a Catalogue of Verbs irregularly inflected.

THAT I might not crowd the notes too much, I have choſen to throw into an Appendix, *a catalogue of verbs irregularly inflected*, excluding thoſe verbs, and parts of verbs, which are become obſolete; that learners may be at no loſs what form of expreſſion to prefer. It is extracted chiefly from Mr. *Ward*'s catalogue; but without taking any notice of his diſtinction of conjugations. When the regular inflection is in uſe, as well as the irregular one, an aſteriſm is put.

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
ariſe.	aroſe.	ariſen.
awake.	awoke.*	awoke.*
bear or *bring forth.*	bare.	born.
bear, or *carry.*	bore.	borne.

Radical

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
beat.	beat.	beaten.
begin.	began.	begun.
bereave.	bereft.*	bereft.*
beſeech	beſought.*	beſought.*
bid.	bade.	bidden.
bind.	bound.	bound.
bite.	bit.	bitten.
blow.	blew.	blown.
bleed.	bled.	bled.
break.	brake.	broken, broke
breed.	bred.	bred.
bring.	brought.	brought.
burſt.	burſt.	burſt, burſten.
buy.	bought.	bought.
caſt.	caſt.	caſt.
catch.	caught.*	caught.*
chide.	chid.	chidden.
choſe.	choſe.	choſen.
cleave	clave.	cloven, cleft.
cling.	clung.	clung.
clothe.	clad.*	clad.*
come.	came.	come.
coſt.	coſt.	coſt.
crow.	crew.	crowed.
cut.	cut.	cut.
dare.	durſt.	dared.
die.	died.	dead.
dig.	dug.*	dug.*
draw.	drew.	drawn.

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
drink.	drank.	drunk.
drive.	drove.	driven.
eat.	ate.	eaten.
fall.	fell.	fallen.
feed.	fed.	fed.
fight.	fought.	fought.
find.	found.	found.
flee.	fled.	fled.
fling.	flung.	flung.
fly.	flew.	flown.
forſake.	forſook.	forſaken.
freeze.	froze.	frozen.
get.	gat, got.	gotten.
give.	gave.	given.
go.	went.	gone.
grind.	ground.	ground.
grow.	grew.	grown.
hang.	hung.*	hung.
hew.	hewed.	hewn.
hide.	hid.	hidden.
hit.	hit.	hit.
hold.	held.	holden, held.
hurt.	hurt.	hurt.
keep.	kept.	kept.
knit.	knitted.	knitted, knit.
know.	knew.	known.
lay.	laid.	laid, lain.
lead.	led.	led.

Radical

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
leave.	left.	left.
let.	let.	let.
lie.	lay.	lain.
load.	loaded.	loaden, laden*
loſe.	loſt.	loſt.
make.	made.	made.
meet.	met.	met.
mow.	mowed.	mown.*
pay.	paid.	paid.
put.	put.	put.
——	quoth he.	——
read.	read.	read.
rend.	rent.	rent.
ring.	rung, rang.	rung.
rive.	rived.	riven.
riſe.	roſe.	riſen.
ride.	rode.	ridden.
run.	ran.	run.
ſaw.	ſawed.	ſawn.
ſee.	ſaw.	ſeen.
ſeek.	ſought.	ſought.
ſeethe.	ſeethed.	ſodden.
ſell.	ſold.	ſold.
ſend.	ſent.	ſent.
ſet.	ſet.	ſet.
ſhake.	ſhook.	ſhaken.
ſhave.	ſhaved.	ſhaven.*
ſhear.	ſheared.	ſhorn.

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
ſhed.	ſhed.	ſhed.
ſhine.	ſhone.	ſhone.*
ſhoe.	ſhod.	ſhod.
ſhoot.	ſhot.	ſhot.
ſhow, ſhew.	ſhowed. ſhewed.	ſhown.* ſhewn.
ſhrink.	ſhrank, ſhrunk	ſhrunk.
ſhut.	ſhut.	ſhut.
ſing.	ſang.	ſung.
ſink.	ſunk.	ſunk.
ſit.	ſat.	ſat.
ſlay.	ſlew.	ſlain.
ſlide.	ſlided.	ſlidden.
ſlink.	ſlunk.	ſlunk.
ſling.	ſlung.	ſlung.
ſlit.	ſlit.	ſlit.
ſmite.	ſmote.	ſmitten.
ſow.	ſowed.	ſown.
ſpeak.	ſpoke.	ſpoken.
ſpeed.	ſped.	ſped.
ſpend.	ſpent.	ſpent.
ſpin.	ſpun.	ſpun.
ſpit.	ſpat.	ſpitted.
ſplit.	ſplit.	ſplit.
ſpread.	ſpread.	ſpread.
ſpring.	ſprung ſprang	ſprung.
ſtand.	ſtood.	ſtood.
ſteal.	ſtole.	ſtolen.
ſtick.	ſtuck.	ſtuck.

Radical

Radical form.	*Preter tenſe.*	*Participle pret.*
ſting.	ſtung.	ſtung.
ſtink.	ſtank.	ſtunk.
ſtride.	ſtrode.	ſtridden.
ſtrike.	ſtruck.	ſtricken.
ſtring.	ſtrung.	ſtrung.
ſtrive.	ſtrove.	ſtriven.
ſtrow.	ſtrowed.	ſtrown.
ſwear.	ſwore, ſware.	ſworn.
ſweat.	ſweat.	ſweat.
ſwell.	ſwelled.	ſwollen.*
ſwim.	ſwam.	ſwum.
ſwing.	ſwung.	ſwung
take.	took.	taken.
teach.	taught.	taught.
tear.	tore; tare.	torn.
tell.	told.	told.
think.	thought.	thought.
thrive.	throve,	thriven.
throw.	threw.	thrown.
thruſt.	thruſt.	thruſt.
tread.	trode.	trodden.
wear.	wore.	worn.
weave.	wove.	woven.
weep.	wept.	wept.
win.	won.	won.
wind.	wound.	wound.*
work.	wrought.	wrought.
wring.	wrung.	wrung.
write.	wrote.	written.

That this catalogue might be reduced into as ſmall a compaſs as poſſible, thoſe irregularities are omitted that have been produced merely by the quick pronunciation of regular preterite tenſes and participles; whereby the *ed* is contracted into *t*. But this contraction is not admitted in ſolemn language, except in verbs which end in *l*, *ll*, or *p*; as *creep*, *crept*; *feel*, *felt*; *dwell*, *dwelt*; though it is ſometimes uſed in words ending in *d*: as *gird*, *gilt*; *gild*, *gelt*, &c.

NOTES,

NOTES

AND

OBSERVATIONS,

For the Uſe of thoſe

Who have made ſome Proficiency in the Language.

NOTES

AND

OBSERVATIONS

For the Use of those

Who have made some Proficiency in the Language.

NOTES and OBSERVATIONS,

For the Uſe of thoſe who have made ſome Proficiency in the Language.

SECTION I.

Of the Plural Number of Nouns.

SOmetimes we find an apoſtrophe uſed in the plural number, when the noun ends in a vowel; as *inamorato's*, *toga's*, *tunica's*, *Otho's*, *a ſet of virtuoſo's*. Addiſon on Medals. *The* idea's *of the author have been converſant with the faults of other writers.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 55. It is alſo uſed, ſometimes when the noun ends in *s*; as, *genius's*, *caduceus's*, *Jacobus's*. Addiſon on Medals. p. 79. But it ſeems better to add *es* in theſe caſes; as, *rendezvouſes*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 113.

Words compounded of *man* have *men* in the plural; as *Alderman*, *aldermen*. *Muſ-*

ſulmans, Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 2. p. 88.) ſeems awkward.

Words derived from foreign languages often retain their original plural terminations; as *Cherubim*, *phænomena*, *radii*, *beaux*. But when foreign words are completely incorporated into our language, they take Engliſh plurals, as *epitomes*. Addiſon. When words of foreign extraction are, as it were, half incorporated into the language, they ſometimes retain their native plurals, and ſometimes acquire thoſe of the Engliſh. Thus ſome perſons write *criterions*, others *criteria*; ſome write *mediums*, and others *media*. Some foreign words both retain their native plurals, and acquire the Engliſh, but they are uſed in different ſenſes. This is the caſe with the word *index*. We ſay *indexes* of books, and *indices* of algebraical quantities.

When a noun is compounded of an adjective, which has not entirely coaleſced with it into one word, it occaſions ſome difficulty where to place the ſign of the plural number, as in the word *handful*. Some would ſay *two hands full*; others, *two handfulls*; and Butler, perhaps for the ſake of the rhyme, writes *two handful*.

For of the lower part, two handful,
It had devoured, *was ſo manful*.

When

When a name has a title prefixed to it, as *Doctor*, *Miſs*, *Maſter &c.* the plural termination affects only the latter of the two words; as, *the two Doctor Nettletons*, *the two Miſs Thomſons*; tho' a ſtrict analogy would plead for the alteration of the former word, and lead us to ſay, *the two Doctors Nettleton*, *the two Miſſes Thomſon*: for, if we ſupplied the ellipſis we ſhould ſay, *the two Doctors of the name of Nettleton*; and, *the two young ladies of the name of Thomſon*; and I remember to have met with this conſtruction ſomewhere, either in Clariſſa, or Sir Charles Grandiſon; but I cannot now recollect the paſſage.

Many of the words which have no ſingular number, denote things which conſiſt of two parts, or go by pairs, and therefore are, in ſome meaſure intitled to a plural termination; as, *lungs*, *bellows*, *breeches*. The word *pair* is generally uſed with many of them; as a *pair of compaſſes*, *a pair of drawers*, *a pair of colours*, *&c.* Alſo many of theſe words denote things which conſiſt of many parts, and therefore, are, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, plurals; as *grains*, *annals*, *oats*, *mallows*, and other plants; *aſhes*, *embers*, *filings*, *vitals*, *hatches*, *cloaths*, *&c.* But others are not eaſily reduced to this rule, and no reaſon can be given why the things might not have been expreſſed by words of the ſingular number;

as *calends*, *nones*, *ides*, *riches*, *odds*, *ſhambles*, *thanks*, *tidings*, *wages*, *victuals*, and things that have only quantity, and do not exiſt in diſtinct parts; as, *the grounds of liquors*, *beaſtings*, *aſſets*, *&c.*

Many of the words which have no ſingular termination, are the names of ſciences; as, *ethics*, *mathematics*, *belles lettres*, *&c.* Many of them are the names of *games*; as, *billiards*, *fives*, &c. Many of them are the names of diſeaſes; as the *meaſles*, *hyſterics*, *glanders*, &c. And ſome, in imitation of the Greek and Latin, are the names of feſtivals, and other ſtated times; as, *orgies*, *matins*, *veſpers*, &c.

Some of theſe words have a ſingular termination in uſe, but it is applied in a different ſenſe, as, *arms*, for weapons, and an *arm* of the body; a pair of *colours* belonging to the army, good *manners*, a perſon's *goods*, good *graces*, a ſoldier's *quarters*, a man's *betters*, *hangings*, *doings*. *And of their* doings *great diſlike declared.* Milton. Some words are alſo found in the ſingular, but more generally in the plural; as *firſt fruits*, *antipodes*, &c.

To expreſs the ſingular of any of theſe words which have only a plural termination in uſe, we have recourſe to a periphraſis; as, *one of the annals*, *one of the grains*, *one of the pleiades*, &c.

Tradeſmen ſay *one pound*, *twenty pound*, &c.

&c. And the ſame rule they obſerve with reſpect to all weights and meaſures. Alſo a gentleman will always ſay, *how many carp* or *how many tench*, &c. have you, and never *how many carps*, or *how many tenches*, &c. This may be ſaid to be ungrammatical; or, at leaſt, a very harſh ellipſis; but cuſtom authorizes it, and many more departures from ſtrict grammar, particularly in converſation. Sometimes writers have adopted this colloquial form of ſpeech. *He is ſaid to have ſhot with his own hands*, fifty brace *of pheaſants*. Addiſon. *When Innocent the* 11*th deſired the Marquis de Eaſtres to furniſh* thirty thouſand head *of ſwine, he could not ſpare them, but* thirty thouſand *lawyers he had at his ſervice*. Addiſon. *A fleet of* thirty-nine ſail. *Hume's Hiſt. vol.* 3. *p.* 448.

Many words, however, in the ſingular number, ſeem to be uſed in the plural conſtruction; when, perhaps, the ſupplying of an ellipſis would make it pretty eaſy. *The Queen dowager became more averſe to* all alliance *with a nation, who had departed ſo far from all ancient principles*. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 833. i. e. *all kinds of alliance*. Thus we ſay, *a thouſand horſe, or foot*; meaning a thouſand of the troops that fight on foot, or with a horſe. *They are a good apple*, i. e. they are of a good ſpecies of the fruit called *an apple*. And thus, alſo, perhaps, may

ſome of the examples in the former paragraph be analized.

Names of mental qualities ſeldom have any plurals, yet when particular acts and not general habits are meant, the plural number ſometimes occurs; as *inſolences*. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 7. p. 411. But it ſeems better to have recourſe to a periphraſis in this caſe. In things of an intellectual nature, the ſingular number will often ſuffice, even when the things ſpoken of are mentioned as belonging to a number of perſons; but if the things be corporeal, though they be uſed in a figurative ſenſe, the plural number ſeems to be required. Thus we ſay, *their deſign*, *their intention*, and perhaps, *their heart*; but not *their head*, or *their mouth*. *This people draws nigh unto me with* their mouth, *and honours me with* their lips, *but* their heart *is far from me*. Matthew. *Ferdinand deſigned to wreſt from the Venetians ſome towns, which his predeceſſor had conſigned to* their hand. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 3. p. 438.

Words that do not admit of a plural, on account of their being of an intellectual nature, are eaſily applied to a number of perſons. Thus we ſay, *the courage of an army*, or *the courage of a thouſand men*; though each man, ſeparately taken, be ſuppoſed to have courage. In theſe caſes if we take away the abſtract and intellectual

tual term, and ſubſtitute another, which is particular and corporeal, we muſt change the number, though the conſtruction and meaning of the ſentence be the ſame. *The enmity of Francis the firſt, and Charles the fifth, ſubſiſted between* their poſterity *for ſeveral ages.* Robertſon's, Hiſt. of Scotland, vol. 1. p. 74. If the author had not uſed the word *poſterity*, which is in the ſingular number, he muſt have ſaid *children* or *ſons*, or *deſcendants*, in the plural.

There are many words which, in general, have no plurals, as *wool*, *wheat*, &c. which people who are much converſant with the things which they ſignify, and who have occaſion to make more diſtinctions among them, uſe in the plural number, and ſometimes thoſe plurals get into writing. *The* coarſer wools *have their uſes alſo.* Preceptor, vol. 2. p. 435. Yet when nouns, which have uſually no plurals are uſed in that number, the effect is very diſagreeable. *But none of the* principal foods *uſed by the inhabitants is cheeſe.* Ulloa's Voyage, vol. 1. p. 304. This conſtruction might eaſily have been avoided by a periphraſis; as, *but one of the principal kinds of food, &c.*

The word *means* belongs to the claſs of words which do not change their termination on account of number; for it is uſed alike in both numbers. *Leſt* this means *ſhould fail.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 65. Some perſons, however, uſe the ſingular

of

of this word, and would ſay, *leſt* this mean *ſhould fail*, and Dr. Lowth pleads for it; but cuſtom has ſo formed our ears, that they do not eaſily admit this form of the word, notwithſtanding it is more agreeable to the general analogy of the language.

The word *pains* is alſo uſed in the ſingular number; *No* pains is *taken*; *Great* pains has *been taken*. Pope. But both this, and the word *means*, are alſo uſed as plurals.

The word *news* is alſo uſed both in the ſingular and plural number. *Pray, Sir,* are *there any* news *of his intimate friend and confident Darmin.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 18. p. 131. News were *brought to the Queen.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 426. Are *there any* news *at preſent ſtirring in London?* Engliſh merchant, p. 7. But notwithſtanding thoſe authorities, the ſingular number ſeems to be more common, and is therefore to be preferred.

The word *billet-doux* is alſo uſed in both numbers. *Her eyes firſt opened on* a billet-doux. Pope's Rape of the Lock.—*Will be carrying about* billet-doux. Arbuthnot.

In ſome caſes we find two plurals in uſe. The word *brother* is an example of this; for we both ſay *brothers* and *brethren*; but the former is uſed of natural relations, and the other in a figurative ſenſe; as, *men and brethren.* The word

die,

die, which makes *dice* when it relates to gaming, makes *dies*, in the plural number, when it relates to coin. The word *cow* formerly had *kine* in the plural number, but we now ſay *cows*. The word *Sir*, has hardly any plural, except in very ſolemn ſtyle, borrowed from the old uſe of it, as, Oh, Sirs, *what ſhall I do to be ſaved?* Acts.

Both the word *folk*, and *folks*, ſeem to be uſed promiſcuouſly, eſpecially in converſation; as when we ſay, *where are the good folks*, or *folk*; but the latter ſeems to be preferable, as the word in the ſingular form implies a number.

Proper names admit of a plural number, where they are figuratively uſed for common names. *It is not enough to have* Vitruviuſes, *we muſt alſo have* Auguſtuſes, to employ them. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 9. p. 27.

It is indifferent, in ſome caſes, whether we uſe a word in the ſingular, or in the plural number. Thus we ſay; *in hopes*, or *in hope*, and in the very ſame ſenſe. *His old inſtructor, imagining that he had now made himſelf acquainted with his diſeaſe of mind, was* in hope *of curing it.* Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 16. *They went* their ways. Matthew. We ſhould now ſay, *went their* way; but, in the Yorkſhire dialect, it is ſtill, *went their* ways. *The laſt Pope was at conſiderable* charges. Addiſon. *Notwithſtanding the ravages of theſe two inſatiable enemies*, their numbers

numbers *can hardly be imagined.* Ulloa's voyage, vol. 4. p. 202. *Their number* would expreſs the whole idea, but perhaps not with the ſame emphaſis. The ſingular number would have been better than the plural in the following ſentence,—*putting our minds into the* diſpoſals *of others.* Locke.

SECTION II.

Of the Genitive Caſe, and other Inflections of Nouns.

IT may ſeem improper to call the *Nominative* a *caſe* (i. e. *caſus, ſive inflectio*) which is the root from whence other caſes are derived; but the practice of all Grammarians, and the long eſtabliſhed definition of terms, authorize this deviation from rigid exactneſs.

The [*f*] at the end of a word, doth not change into [*v*] for the genitive caſe, as it doth in the plural number. We ſay *a* wife's *fortune*; but, *he takes more* wives *than one.*

The

The *apoſtrophe* denotes the omiſſion of an [*i*] which was formerly inſerted, and made an addition of a ſyllable to the word.—— Mr. *Pope*, and ſome of his cotemporaries, to avoid a harſhneſs in the pronunciation of ſome genitives, wrote the word [*his*] at the end of the word; as *Statius his Thebais*, *Socrates his fetters* (Spect.) imagining the ['*s*] to be a contraction for that pronoun: But analogy eaſily overturns that ſuppoſition; for *Venus his beauty*, or *Men his wit*, were abſurd.

The genitive neceſſarily occaſions the addition of a ſyllable to words ending in [*s*], and the other terminations which have the ſame effect in the plural number; as *Venus's beauty*, *Moſes's rod*. But this is more common with poets, when the additional ſyllable would have been more than their verſe required.

Sometimes the apoſtrophe is wholly omitted, even after the plural number; tho', in that caſe, there is no other ſign of the genitive caſe. *A collection of* writers *faults*. Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 55. *After ten* years *wars*. Swift.

When, in this and other caſes, the terminations of words are ſuch, that the ſound makes no diſtinction between the genitive of the ſingular and of the plural number; as, *the prince's injuries*; and *prince's injuries*. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 5. p. 406. it ſhould ſeem

ſeem to be better to decline the uſe of the genitive in the plural number, and ſay, *the injuries of princes.*

The Engliſh genitive has often a very harſh ſound, ſo that, in imitation of the French, we daily make more uſe of the particle, *of*, as they do of *de*, to expreſs the ſame relation. There is ſomething aukward in the following ſentences, in which this method has not been taken. *The general, in the* army's name, *publiſhed a declaration.* Hume. *The Commons' vote.* Hume's Hiſtory. vol. 8. p. 217. *The Lords' houſe.* Id. *Unleſs he be very ignorant of* the kingdom's condition. Swift. It were certainly better to ſay; *In the name of the army, the votes of the Commons, the houſe of Lords, the condition of the kingdom.* Beſides, *the Lord's houſe*, which is the ſame in ſound with *Lords' Houſe*, is an expreſſion almoſt appropriated to a place ſet apart for chriſtian worſhip.

When an entire clauſe of a ſentence, beginning with a participle of the preſent tenſe, is uſed as one name, or to expreſs one idea, or circumſtance, the noun on which it depends may be put in the genitive caſe. Thus, inſtead of ſaying, *What is the meaning of this lady holding up her train*, i. e. *what is the meaning of the lady in holding up her train*, we may ſay, *What is the meaning of this* lady's *holding up her train*, juſt

as

as we ſay, *What is the meaning of this lady's dreſs, &c.* So we may either ſay, *I remember* it being *reckoned a great exploit*; or, perhaps more elegant, *I remember* its being *reckoned, &c.*

When a name is complex, conſiſting of more terms than one, the genitive is made by ſubjoining the [*s*] to the laſt of the terms. *For Herodias' ſake, his brother Philip's wife.* Matthew. *Lord Feverſham the general's tent.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 264. This conſtruction, however, often ſeems to be aukward. It would have been eaſier and better to have ſaid, *The tent of lord Feverſham the general, &c.* When a term conſiſts of a name, and an office, or any term explanatory of the former, it may occaſion ſome doubt to which of them the ſign of the genitive ſhould be annexed, or whether it ſhould be ſubjoined to them both. Thus, ſome would ſay, *I left the parcel at Mr. Smith's the bookſeller*: and perhaps others, *at Mr. Smith the bookſeller's.* The laſt of theſe forms is moſt agreeable to the Latin idiom, but the firſt ſeems to be more natural in ours; and if the addition conſiſt of two or more words, the caſe ſeems to be very clear; as, *I left the parcel at Mr. Smith's the bookſeller and ſtationer, i. e.* at Mr. Smith's, who is a bookſeller and ſtationer, tho' the relative does not eaſily follow a genitive caſe.

It is by no means elegant to uſe two

Engliſh

Engliſh genitives in conſtruction with the ſame noun. *He ſummoned an aſſembly of biſhops and abbots, whom he acquainted with* the pope's *and the* king's pleaſure, Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 177. *The pleaſure of the pope, and the king*, would have been better.

In ſome caſes we uſe both the genitive and the prepoſition *of*; as, *this book of my friend's*. Sometimes, indeed, this method is quite neceſſary, in order to diſtinguiſh the ſenſe, and to give the idea of property, ſtrictly ſo called, which is the moſt important of the relations expreſſed by a genitive caſe. *This picture of my friend*, and *this picture of my friend's*, ſuggeſt very different ideas. The latter only is that of property in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. Where this double genitive as it may be called, is not neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the ſenſe, and eſpecially in grave ſtile, it is generally omitted. Thus we ſay, *It is a diſcovery of Sir Iſaac Newton's*. That this double genitive is ſufficiently agreeable to the analogy of the Engliſh language, is evident from the uſual conjunction of the pronoun poſſeſſive with the prepoſition *of*, both of which have the force of a genitive. *This exactneſs of his.* Triſtram Shandy, vol. 1. p. 12. In reality, this double genitive may be reſolved into two; for, *this is a book of my friend's*, is the ſame as, *this is one of the books of my friend.*

The

The Engliſh modifications of a word to expreſs the feminine gender, extends not to many words in our language, and the analogy fails when we ſhould moſt expect it would be kept up. Thus we do not call a female author, an *authoreſs*; and if a lady write poems, ſhe is now-a-days called a *poet*, rather than a *poeteſs*, which is almoſt obſolete.

A few of our feminine terminations are Latin, with little or no variation, as *adminiſtrator*, *adminiſtratrix*; *director*, *directrix*; *hero*, *heroine*.

The maſculine gender is ſometimes expreſſed by prefixing words which are known to be the names of males; as, a *dog*, *fox*, *jack-aſs*, &c. but generally the maſculine is denoted by *he*, and the feminine *ſhe*; as, *he-fox*, *ſhe fox*.

SECTION III.

Of Adjectives.

THE adjective *enough* may be ſaid to have a plural in our language; for we ſay *enough* with reſpect to quantity, which is ſingular; and *enow* with reſpect

pect to number, which is plural. *I think there are at Rome* enow *modern works of architecture.* Addiſon. *There are* enow *of zealots of both ſides.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 32.

The word *every* is by ſome writers tranſpoſed, and connected with the perſonal pronouns, in a manner that ſeems to ſound harſh to an Engliſh ear.

Palmyra, thou commandſt my every thought, i. e. *all my thoughts.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 25. pag. 82.

My ev'ry thought *my* ev'ry hope *is fix'd On him alone.* Ib. vol. 18. p. 10.

The which conduct, throughout every, its minuteſt energy. Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 189.

Some adjectives of number are more eaſily converted into ſubſtantives than others. Thus we more eaſily ſay, *a million of men*, than *a thouſand of men.* On the other hand, it will hardly be admitted to ſay *a million men*, whereas *a thouſand men* is quite familiar. Yet, in the plural number, a different conſtruction ſeems to be required. We ſay *ſome hundreds*, or *thouſands*, as well as *millions of men.* Perhaps, on this account, the words *million, hundreds*, and *thouſands*, will be ſaid to be ſubſtantives.

In

In numbering we often reckon by twenties, calling them *ſcores*; as *three ſcore*, *four ſcore*, tho' we never ſay *two ſcore*.

In ſome few caſes we ſeem, after the manner of the Greeks, to make the adjective agree with the ſubject of the affirmation; when, in ſtrictneſs, it belongs to ſome other word in the ſentence; as, *you had better do it*; for, *it would be better for you to do it*.

An adjective and a ſubſtantive are both united in the word *aught*, put for *any thing*, and *nought* put for *nothing*. *For aught which to me appears contrary*. Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 21. *Nought was wanting*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol 6. p. 5. Theſe contractions, however, are but little uſed, and are hardly to be approved of.

The word *leſſer*, though condemned by Dr. Johnſon, and other Engliſh grammarians, is often uſed by good writers. *The greater number frequently fly before the* leſſer. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 1. p. 172. *The kings of France were the chief of ſeveral greater vaſſals, by whom they were very ill obeyed, and of a greater number of* leſſer *ones*. Ib. vol. 6. p. 127.

Sometimes the comparative of *late* is written *latter*, as well as *later*; and, I think, we uſe thoſe two comparatives in different ſenſes. The *latter of two*, I fancy,

cy, refers either to place or time, whereas *later* reſpects time only.

In ſeveral adjectives the termination *moſt* is uſed to expreſs the ſuperlative degree; as, *hindermoſt*, or *hindmoſt*; *hithermoſt* (almoſt obſolete); *uppermoſt*, *undermoſt*, *nethermoſt*, *innermoſt*, *outermoſt*, *uttermoſt* or *utmoſt*. Some of theſe have no comparatives, or poſitives, or none that are adjectives.

The adjective *old* is compared two ways. We both ſay *older*, and *oldeſt*; and likewiſe, *elder*, and *eldeſt*; but uſe ſeems to have aſſigned to them different acceptations; for *elder*, and *eldeſt*, ſeem to refer to priority of rank or privilege, in conſequence of age; whereas *older* and *oldeſt*, reſpect the number of years only. Speaking of two very old perſons, we ſhould naturally ſay, that one of them was the *older of the two*; but ſpeaking of two brothers, with reſpect to the right of inheritance, we ſhould ſay, that one of them was *the elder of the two*.

Several adverbs are uſed, in an elegant manner, to anſwer the purpoſe of degrees of compariſon. There is great beauty in the uſe of the word *rather*, to expreſs a mall degree, or exceſs of a quality. *She is rather profuſe in her expences.* Critical Review, No. 90. p. 43.

The

The word *full* is likewiſe uſed to expreſs a ſmall exceſs of any quality. Thus we ſay, *The tea is* full *weak*, or full *ſtrong*; but this is only a colloquial phraſe.

The prepoſition *with* is alſo ſometimes uſed in converſation, to expreſs a degree of quality ſomething leſs than the greateſt; as, *They are* with *the wideſt*.

Sometimes comparatives are uſed in a ſenſe merely poſitive, ſo that it may occaſion a little ſurpriſe to find them uſed in a ſenſe ſtrictly comparative; as the phraſe *wiſer and better* in the following ſentence. *It is a glorious privilege, and he who practiſes it, may grow* wiſer and better *by an hour's ſerious meditation, than by a month's reading*. Female American. vol. 1. p. 103.

There are ſome *Diſſyllables* which would not admit the termination [*er*] or [*eſt*] without a harſhneſs in the pronunciation. It is therefore, uſual to compare them in the ſame manner as *Poliſyllables*, without any change of termination. Of theſe, Dr. Johnſon has given us the following enumerations; viz. ſuch as terminate in,

ſome, as *fulſome*.
ful, as *careful*.
ing, as *trifling*.
ous, as *porous*.
leſs, as *careleſs*.
ive, as, *miſſive*.
dy, as *woody*.
fy, as *puffy*,
ky, as *rocky*; except *lucky*.

ed,

ed, as *wretched*.
id, as *candid*.
al, as *mortal*.
ent, as *recent*.
ain, as *certain*.
my, as *roomy*.
ny, as *ſkinny*.
py, as *ropy*; except *happy*.
ry, as *hoary*.

Some adjectives do not, in their own nature, and by reaſon of their ſignification, admit of compariſon; ſuch as *univerſal*, *perfect*, &c. yet it is not uncommon to ſee the comparative or ſuperlative of ſuch words; being uſed, either thro' inadvertency, or for the ſake of emphaſis. *He ſometimes claims admiſſion to the* chiefeſt *offices of the army.* Clarendon. *The quarrel was become* ſo univerſal *and national.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 258. *A method of attaining* the righteſt *and greateſt happineſs.* Price.

There is ſtill a greater impropriety in a double comparative, or a double ſuperlative. Dr. Lowth thinks there is a ſingular propriety in the phraſe *moſt higheſt*, which is peculiar to the old tranſlation of the Pſams. But I own it offends my ears, which may, perhaps, be owing to my not having been accuſtomed to that tranſlation.

It is very common to ſee the ſuperlative uſed for the comparative degree, when only two perſons or things are ſpoken of.

It

It began to be the intereſt of their neighbours, to oppoſe the ſtrongeſt and moſt enterpriſing of the two. Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 231. This is a very pardonable overſight.

In converſation, I do not ſay the moſt polite, we ſometimes hear the word *only* which is a diminutive, joined to the ſuperlative degree; as, *He is* only the cleverest *fellow I ever ſaw.* Originally, this form of expreſſion might have been deſigned to expreſs ridicule, or contempt for a perſon who had undervalued another. It is now uſed, when no reply is made to any thing ſaid before, but in an affected, oſtentatious way of ſpeaking.

In ſome caſes we find ſubſtantives, without any alteration, uſed for adjectives *In the* flux condition *of human affairs.* Bolingbroke, on hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 199. *A muſlin flounce, made very full, would give a very agreeable* flirtation air. Pope. *Chance companions.* Of this kind are, *an alabaſter column, a ſilver tankard, a grammar ſchool,* and moſt other compound nouns.

Engliſh writers, agreeable to the well known idiom of the language, generally write *Scottiſh,* juſt as we ſay Spaniſh, Iriſh, &c. and ſometimes it is contracted into *Scotch*; but Mr. Hume always uſes the

ſubſtantive *Scots* inſtead of it. *The Scots commiſſioners.* Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 379.

The ſubſtantive *plenty*, is frequently uſed for the adjective *plentiful*. *In the reign of Henry the 2d, all foreign commodities were* plenty *in England.* Poſtlethwaite on Commerce, p. 414. i. e. were plentiful, or in plenty.

Names of towns and places, by the ſame kind of ellipſis, are very often uſed for adjectives. Thus we ſpeak of *our London*, or *Jamaica friends*; i. e. meaning our friends in London or Jamaica.

When the name of a country cannot eaſily be transformed into an adjective, it ſeems the beſt to make uſe of the preposition *of*. *The noblemen of Bretaigne* would, I think, be better than the *Bretaigne noblemen.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 433.

The word *friends* is uſed as an adjective in the phraſe, *Will you* be friends *with me.* Perſian tales, vol. 2. p. 248. *i. e.* friendly, or in friendſhip with me.

Adjectives are often put for adverbs, but the practice is hardly to be approved, except in caſes where long cuſtom has made the example quite eaſy; as, *exceeding* for *exceedingly*, *near* for *nearly*. *Our wealth being near finiſhed.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 43. The following examples are

are not ſo eaſy. *The people are* miſerable poor, *and ſubſiſt on fiſh. Extreme jealous.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 11. The word *exceeding* makes a worſe adjective than it does an adverb. *I was taking a view of Weſtminſter-abbey, with an old gentleman of* exceeding honeſty, *but the ſame degree of underſtanding as that I have deſcribed.* Shenſtone's Works, vol. 2. p. 45. It ſhould have been exceeding great honeſty.

Like ſeems to be put for *likely*, in the following ſentence: *What the conſequences of this management are like to be*; i. e. *what they are* likely *to be*, or *what they are*, according to all probability, *to be.*

SECTION IV.

Of Pronouns.

I. *Of Pronouns in general.*

IT might not have been improper to have claſſed all the *pronouns* under the heads of *Subſtantives* or *Adjectives*; the *perſonal* pronouns being of the former kind, and all the other denominations of the latter. The reaſon why they are conſidered ſeparately is becauſe there is ſomething

particular in their inflections. By this means therefore, the rules relating to *ſubſtantives* and *adjectives* in general, are rendered more ſimple, and a more diſtinct view is given of the irregular inflections of thoſe words which have been uſually called *Pronouns*.

I, is called the *firſt* perſon; *Thou* the *ſecond*; and *He*, *She*, or *It*, the *third* perſon.

By the complaiſance of modern times, we uſe the plural *you* inſtead of the ſingular *thou*, when we mean to ſpeak reſpectfully to any perſon; but we do not uſe *ye* in this manner We ſay *you*, not *ye*, *are reading*. However in very ſolemn ſtyle, and particularly in an addreſs to the Divine Being, we uſe *thou*, and not *you*.

In ſpeaking of children, we ſometimes uſe the third perſon ſingular, inſtead of the ſecond; as, *will he*, or *ſhe* do it. The Germans uſe the third perſon plural, when they ſpeak the moſt reſpectfully.

The pronouns *you*, and *your* are ſometimes uſed with little regard to their proper meaning; for the ſpeaker has juſt as much intereſt in the caſe as thoſe he addreſſes. This ſtile is oſtentatious, and doth not ſuit grave writing. *Not only* your *men of more refined and ſolid parts and learning*, *but even* your *alchymiſt*, *and*, your *fortune-teller*, *will diſcover the ſecrets of their art*

in

in Homer and Virgil. Addiſon on Medals, p. 32.

For want of a ſufficient variety of perſonal pronouns of the third perſon, we are often obliged, in a complex ſentence, to have recourſe to explanations which cannot be introduced without appearing very aukward. *Peregrine ſpoke not a word in anſwer to this declaration, which he immediately imputed to the ill offices of the miniſter, againſt whom he breathed defiance and revenge, in his way to the lodgings of Cadwallader; who, being made acquainted with the manner of his reception, begged he would deſiſt from all ſchemes of vengeance, until he* Crabtree) *ſhould be able to unriddle the myſtery of the whole.* Peregrine Pickle, vol. 4. p. 129. *In conſequence of this retreat he,* (the huſband) *was diſabled from paying a conſiderable ſum.* Ib. p. 242.

Aukward as this conſtruction is, it were to be wiſhed, that hiſtorians had made more uſe of it; as, at leaſt, they would have been more intelligible than they ſometimes are without it. *They* [meaning the French] *marched precipitately, as to an aſſured victory; whereas the Engliſh advanced very ſlowly, and diſcharged ſuch flights of arrows, as did great execution. When* they *drew near the archers, perceiving that* they *were out of breath, charged* them *with great vigour.* Univerſal Hiſt. vol. 23. p. 517. If an attention to the ſenſe, in theſe caſes, would relieve the am-

biguity; yet the attention it requires is painful, and difficult to be kept up.

The pronoun *it* is ſometimes uſed at the ſame time with the word for which it might have been ſubſtituted, and even precedes it; tho' ſuch a word is generally called the antecedent of the pronoun. It is *our duty to do to others as we would that they ſhould do to us*. If this complex antecedent, which is the proper nominative caſe to the verb *is*, be made to precede that verb, the pronoun will be ſuperfluous, and the ſentence will read thus, *To do to others, as we would that they ſhould do to us, is our duty.*

This conſtruction of the pronoun *it* is ſo common, and we ſo naturally expect the antecedent to follow it, or to be underſtood after it; that when the antecedent comes regularly before it, as before any other pronoun, the ſenſe is, ſometimes in danger of being miſtaken. *Who* (meaning the king) *notwithſtanding he relates, that the prudent foreſight of the commons had cut off all the means, whereby Charles could procure money, thoſe nerves of power without which*, it is impoſſible *to exiſt*. Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 2. The phraſe, *it is impoſſible to exiſt*, gives us the idea of its being impoſſible for men, or any body to exiſt; whereas, *power* is the thing that the author meant could not exiſt without money.

Sometimes

Sometimes the true antecedent of this pronoun is ſo concealed in other words, that it requires ſome attention to diſcover it. *How far do you call* it *to ſuch a place? You will have* it *to be three miles.* That is, *how great a diſtance do you call it? You will have the diſtance to be three miles.*

Not only things, but perſons may be the antecedent to this pronoun. *What is it? Is it not Thomas?* i. e. *Who is the perſon? Is not he Thomas?*

Sometimes, in imitation of the French, this pronoun may be uſed for a perſon in another manner, by being ſubſtituted for *he*. *What a deſperate fellow* it is. But this is only in converſation, and familiar ſtyle.

In one very odd phraſe, which alſo occurs in converſation, eſpecially in ſome counties of England, the pronoun *it* is put in the place of a perſonal pronoun, and the perſonal pronoun in the place of it. *He put him into the head of it. It is upon a ſubject perfectly new, and thoſe dogs there put me into the head of it.* Pompey the Little, p. 246. in ridicule of the phraſe.

Sometimes this ſame pronoun connects ſo cloſely with the verb, that it ſeems only to modify its meaning, and not to have any ſeparate ſignification of its own. *The king carried* it *with a high hand.* Parliamentary Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 14. i. e. *the king behaved with haughtineſs.*

If there be any antecedent in ſome ſuch phraſes as theſe, it is ſuch a complex idea, that I do not think it is poſſible to give a preciſe definition of it. I ſhall ſubjoin a curious example of this.

Let me beg of you, like an unbacked filly, to friſk it, *to ſquirt* it, *to jump* it, *to rear* it, *to bound* it, *and to kick* it, *with long kicks, and ſhort kicks, till you break the ſtrap or a crupper, and throw his worſhip into the dirt.* Triſtram Shandy, vol. 3. p. 167.

The pronouns *poſſeſſive* [indicating *property* or *poſſeſſion*] might not improperly have been called the *genitive* caſes of their correſponding *perſonal* pronouns, were it not that their formation is not analogous to that of the genitive caſes of other words.

Sometimes theſe poſſeſſives have an apoſtrophe before the *s*, when they are found without their ſubſtantives, which gives them more the appearance of a genitive caſe. *That you may call her your's.* Fair American, vol. 2. p. 64.

Formerly, *mine* and *thine* were uſed inſtead of *my* and *thy* before a vowel. They are generally retained in our preſent Engliſh verſion of the Bible; and, perhaps, for this reaſon, give a peculiar ſolemnity to the ſtyle, *By the greatneſs of* thine *arm.* Exodus, ch. 15. ver. 16. *And bring them to* thine *everlaſting kingdom.* Common Prayer.

The

The pronoun *his* was not always confined to perſons, but was formerly applied to things alſo. *This rule is not ſo general, but that* it *admitteth* his *exceptions*. Carew.

For want of a ſufficient variety of perſonal pronouns of the third perſon, and their poſſeſſives, our language labours under an ambiguity, which is unknown in moſt others. *The eagle killed the hen, and eat her in* her own *neſt*. *He ſent* him *to kill* his own *father*. Nothing but the ſenſe of the preceding ſentences can determine what neſt, the *hen*'s, or the *eagle*'s, is meant in the former of theſe examples; or whoſe father, his that gave the order, or his that was to execute it, in the latter.

Sometimes theſe pronouns poſſeſſive do not ſtrictly imply property, and on this account occaſion an ambiguity in a ſentence. *But is it poſſible I ſhould not grieve for* his loſs? Fair American, vol. 1. p. 28. Meaning the loſs of her father, who was dead; but the meaning might have been a loſs which her father had ſuſtained.

According to the Engliſh idiom, we generally prefix the pronoun *my* to the title of *Lord*; as *my Lord Bedford*, but this ſtyle ſeems to imply ſome degree of familiarity; and perſons who pretend not to any ſort of intimacy with the nobility, do not commonly uſe it. Indeed it ſeems proper to the ſtyle of a king, whoſe Lords they originally

ginally were, and whoſe manner it is to ſay, *my ſubjects, my kingdom, my Lords and gentlemen, my ſhips, my army, &c.* Foreigners often confound this pronoun with the word *Lord*, as if they made but one word; as, *a mylord.*

When the relative is preceded by two perſonal pronouns, as antecedents, it may, in ſome caſes, relate to the former, and in others to the latter of them, according as the ſenſe may point out its reference, but it is generally the latter that is referred to; as *I am he that liveth, and was dead:* where the antecedent of *that* is *he*, which immediately precedes it; *he that liveth* being conſidered as one idea, or character, to which the perſon intended by *I* anſwers. Yet *I am he, that* live, *and was dead*, could hardly be condemned if it be conſidered, who it is that liveth, viz. *I.*

When the relative follows two nouns, connected by the particle *of*, it is abſolutely impoſſible to ſay, to which of them it refers; becauſe the cuſtom of the language has made it equally applicable to either of them. When we ſay, *the diſciples of Chriſt*, whom *we imitate*, we may mean the imitation either of Chriſt, or of his diſciples. Here we find the want of a diſtinction of numbers, in the pronoun relative.

When the words are ſeparated by other prepoſitions, there is, ſometimes, the ſame ambiguity. *He was taking a view, from a window*

window of St. Chad's cathedral, in Litchfield, where [i. e. in which] *a party of the royaliſts had fortified themſelves.* Hume's Hiſtory. vol. 6. p. 449. Quere, was it in the cathedral, or in the town, that the party of the royaliſts were fortified?

The pronouns *Relative* and *Demonſtrative*, are nearly allied; every pronoun *demonſtrative*, when not immediately preceding a ſubſtantive, referring to an *antecedent* one; as alſo do the *poſſeſſives:* And, being all of the nature of *adjectives*, it is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe.

The pronouns *demonſtrative* ars ſo called, becauſe when we make uſe of them, we, as it were, *point out* the thing that we ſpeak of; for ſuch is the import of the word *(demonſtrative)* from which the term is derived.

The demonſtrative *this* refers to the nearer, or the laſt mentioned particular, and *that* to the more remote, or the firſt mentioned. *More rain falls in June and July, than in December and January; but it makes much greater ſhow upon the earth in* theſe *than in* thoſe; *becauſe it lies longer upon it.* Woodward.

The pronoun *this*, or *thoſe*, without the relative and verb ſubſtantive, but ill ſupplies the place of a noun ſubſtantive, which ought to be its antecedent. *The land was always poſſeſſed, during pleaſure, by* thoſe *intruſted*

truſted with the command. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 109. i. e. *thoſe perſons intruſted, or thoſe who were intruſted. All* thoſe *poſſeſſed of any office reſigned their former commiſſion.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 304.

Many perſons are apt, in converſation, to put the oblique caſe of the perſonal pronouns, in the place of *theſe* and *thoſe*; as, *Give me them books*, inſtead of *thoſe books*. We may ſometimes, find this fault even in writing. *Obſerve* them three there. Devil upon Crutches.

It is not, however, always eaſy to ſay, whether a perſonal pronoun, or a demonſtrative is preferable in certain conſtructions. *We are not unacquainted with the calumny* of them [*or* thoſe] *who openly make uſe of the warmeſt profeſſions.* Preceptor, vol. 2. p. 429.

The demonſtrative, *that*, is ſometimes uſed very emphatically for *ſo much. But the circulation of things, occaſioned by commerce, is not of that moment as the tranſplantation, which human nature itſelf has undergone.* Spirit of Nations, p. 22.

Sometimes this ſame pronoun is elegantly uſed for *ſo great*, or *ſuch a. Some of them have gone to* that *height of extravagance, as to aſſert, that that performance had been immediately dictated by the holy ghoſt.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 288. *It muſt reaſonably*

reaſonably appear doubtful, whether human ſociety could ever arrive at that *ſtate of perfection, as to ſupport itſelf with no other controul, than the general and rigid maxims of law and equity.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 317. In all theſe caſes, however, it ſhould ſeem, that the common conſtruction is generally preferable.

Sometimes this pronoun is introduced in the latter part of a ſentence; where it is ſuperfluous with reſpect to the grammar, and where it has no direct antecedent; but where it is of conſiderable uſe in point of emphaſis. *By what arguments he could engage the French to offer ſuch an inſult to the Spaniſh nation, from whom he met with ſuch generous treatment; by what colours he could diſguiſe the ingratitude, and impudence of ſuch a meaſure*; theſe *are wholly unknown to us.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 59 *As to the preciſe and definite idea,* this *may be ſtill a ſecret.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 5.

The word *what* is a contraction for *that which*, and therefore ſhould not be uſed inſtead of *which* only. *Beſides, it happens with regard to ambitious aims and projects* what *may be obſerved with regard to ſects of philoſophy and religion.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 74. This ſentence can no otherwiſe be reduced to ſufficient correctneſs than by reading, *it happens—which. I would not willingly inſiſt upon it as an advantage, in our European cuſtoms,* what *was obſerved*

ſerved, by Mahomet Effendi, the laſt Turkiſh ambaſſador in France. Ib. p. 252.

In ſome dialects, the word *what* is uſed for *that*, and ſometimes we find it in this ſenſe in writing. *Neither Lady Haverſham nor Miſs Mildmay will ever believe, but* what *I have been entirely to blame.* Louiſa Mildmay, vol. 1. p. 179. *I am not ſatisfied,* but what *the integrity of our friends is more eſſential to our welfare than their knowledge of the world.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 114.

What is ſometimes put off for *all the*, or words nearly equivalent. What *appearances of worth afterwards ſucceeded, were drawn from thence.* Internal policy of Great Britain, p. 196. i. e. *all the appearances.*

The word *other* ſeems to be uſed like an adjective in the comparative degree requiring *than* after it; but then it ſhould have *a*, *any*, or ſome word equivalent to the article before it. *Such inſtitutions are too diabolical, to be derived from* other *than an infernal demon.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 24. i. e. *from any other. He frequently paſſed whole days in a hollow tree, without* other *company or amuſement, than his Bible.* Ib. vol. 7. p. 342.

When this pronoun is ſeparated from its ſubſtantive, which follows it, by nothing but the particle *of*, not having the force

force of a genitive caſe, or implying poſſeſſion, but merely explanatory, as it may be called; it may, I think, be doubted, whether the plural *s*, ſhould be added to it, or not. *The ſons of Zebedee, and two* other *of his diſciples.* John, ch. 21. v. 2. Some might write, *two other of his diſciples*, i. e. *two others, who were his diſciples*, or *among his diſciples.*

The word *ſomewhat*, in the following ſentence of Hume, ſeems to be uſed improperly. *Theſe puniſhments ſeems to have been exerciſed in* ſomewhat *an arbitrary manner.* Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 371. Sometimes we read, *in ſomewhat of.* The meaning is, *in a manner which is, in ſome reſpects, arbitrary.*

The word *one* hath alſo a *pronominal* uſe, and may then be as properly claſſed among the *Demonſtratives* as *other* and *the ſame*; as, *He is* one *that I eſteem.* One *might make a magazine of all ſorts of antiquities.* Addiſon.

We ſometimes uſe the pronoun *one* in the ſame ſenſe in which *on* is uſed in French. One *would imagine theſe to be the expreſſions of a man bleſſed with eaſe.* Atterbury.

This pronoun *one* has a plural number, when it is uſed without a ſubſtantive. *There are many whoſe waking thoughts are wholly empl yed in their ſleeping* ones. Addiſon.

I ſhall

I ſhall here mention a remarkable ambiguity in the uſe of the word *one*, when it is no pronoun. And it is ſuch as, I think, cannot, be avoided, except by a periphraſis, in any language. *I cannot find* one *of my books*. By theſe words I may either mean, that all the books are miſſing; or only one of them; but the tone of voice, with which they are ſpoken, will eaſily diſtinguiſh in this caſe.

The word *none* has, generally, the force of a pronoun; as, *Where are the books? I have* none *of them*. In this caſe, it ſeems to be the ſame word with the adjective *no*; for where *no* is uſed with the ſubſtantive, *none* is uſed without it; for we ſay, *I have no books*; or, *I have none*. This word is uſed in a very peculiar ſenſe. *Iſrael would* none *of me*. *I like* none *of it*. i. e. would not have me at all; do not like it at all.

Under the article of *Pronouns* the following words, and parts of words, that are often joined with pronouns to increaſe their emphaſis, muſt be taken notice of. By the addition of *ſoever*, *who* and *what* become *whatſoever* and *whatſoever*. The indeclinable particle *own* added to the poſſeſſives makes *my*, *thy*, &c. become *my own*, *thy own*, &c. *Self* and its plural number, *ſelves*, are added likewiſe to the *poſſeſſives*, and ſometimes to the oblique caſes of the *perſonal* pronouns; as *myſelf*, *yourſelves*, *himſelf*, *themſelves*; and, laſtly, the article [*a*] joined to the ſimple

pronoun.

pronoun *other*, makes it the compound *another*.

Hiſelf, and *theirſelves*, were formerly uſed for *himſelf* and *themſelves*. *Every one of us, each for hiſelf, laboured how to recover him.* Sidney.

Ourſelf peculiar to the royal ſtyle; for the king only can properly make uſe of it. *We* ourſelf *will follow.* Shakeſpeare.

II. *Of Pronouns Relative.*

Formerly the words *who* and *which* were uſed without diſtinction; but cuſtom hath now appropriated *who* to *perſons*, and *which* to *things*.

It is not neceſſary that the relative *who* have an expreſs perſonal antecedent. It is ſufficient if it be implied in the pronoun poſſeſſive; as, *thy goodneſs* who art, i. e. *the goodneſs of thee who art.*

This pronoun, however, is ſo much appropriated to perſons, that there is generally harſhneſs in the application of it, except to the proper names of perſons or the general terms, man, woman, &c. A term which only implies the idea of perſons, and expreſſes them by ſome circumſtance or epithet, will hardly authorize the uſe of it. *That* faction *in England* who *moſt powerfully oppoſed his arbitrary pretenſions.* Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 21: It had better

better have been *that faction which*, and the ſame remark will ſerve for the following examples. France, who *was in alliance with Sweden.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 6. p. 187. *The* court, who *began to ſtudy the European more nearly than heretofore.* Ib. vol. 9. p. 141. *The cavalry who.* Ib. p. 227. *The* cities, who *aſpired at liberty.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 32. *That* party *among us*, who *boaſt of the higheſt regard to liberty, have not poſſeſſed ſufficient liberty of thought in this particular.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 312. *The* family, whom, *at firſt, they conſider as uſurpers.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 298. If a perſonification had been intended in theſe caſes, *who* would have been proper; but in the ſtyle of hiſtory, there can ſeldom be a propriety in it, at leaſt it cannot be pretended in theſe inſtances.

In ſome caſes it may be doubtful whether this pronoun be properly applied or not. *The number of ſubſtantial* inhabitants *with* whom *ſome cities abound.* Squire's Anglo-Saxon Government, p. 318. For when a term directly, and neceſſarily implies perſons, it certainly may, in many caſes, claim the perſonal relative. *None of the* company, whom *he moſt affected, could cure him of the melancholy under which he laboured.* Female American, vol. 1. p. 52. The word *acquaintance*, may have the ſame conſtruction.

We

We hardly conſider children as perſons, becauſe that term gives us the idea of reaſon and reflection; and therefore, the application of the perſonal relative *who*, in this caſe, ſeems to be harſh. *A child, who.* Cadogan.

It is ſtill more improperly applied to animals. *A lake, frequented by that* fowl, whom *nature has taught to dip the wing in water.* Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 4.

When the name of a perſon is uſed merely as a name, and does not refer to the perſon; the pronoun *which* ought to be uſed, and not *who. It is no wonder if a man, made up of ſuch contrarieties, did not ſhine at the court of Queen* Elizabeth, who *was but another name for prudence and œconomy.*

The word *whoſe* begins likewiſe to be reſtricted to perſons, but it is not done ſo generally but that good writers, and even in proſe, uſe it when ſpeaking of things. I do not think, however, that the conſtruction is generally pleaſing. *Pleaſure, whoſe nature.* Hume. *Call every* production, whoſe *parts exiſt all at once, and* whoſe *nature depends not on a tranſition for its exiſtence, a work or thing done, and not energy, or operation.* Harris's Hermes. *A true critic in the peruſal of a book, is like a* dog *at a feaſt*; whoſe *thought and ſtomach are wholly ſet upon what the gueſts fling away.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 63.

In

In one caſe, however, cuſtom authorizes us to uſe *which*, with reſpect to perſons; and that is, when we want to diſtinguiſh one perſon of two, or a particular perſon among a number of others. We ſhould then ſay, *Which of the two, or which of them is he or ſhe?*

That is alſo uſed as a relative, inſtead of *who* or *which*; as *the man* that [*for* whom] I *loved*. *The houſe* that [*for* which] *I have built*. In which caſe it is indeclinable; as *The men* that *I feared*.

The pronouns *that*, and *who*, or *which*, may often be uſed promiſcuouſly; but after an adjective, eſpecially in the ſuperlative degree, *who* or *which* cannot be admitted. *The followers of Catiline were the* moſt profligate, which *could be called out of the moſt corrupt city of the univerſe.* Riſe and Fall of antient Republicks, p. 282. *Lord Henry Sidney was one of the* wiſeſt and moſt active *governors*, whom *Ireland had enjoyed for ſeveral years.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 415. *The* ableſt *miniſter* whom *James ever poſſeſſed.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 10. *Rumours continually prevailed in the camp, that the adverſe Faction in London were making great preparations to overthrow* all which *had been yielded in favour of the army.* Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 335. This conſtruction, which appears to me very aukward (though not

contrary

contrary to the rules of any Engliſh grammar) is generally uſed by this writer; but, in all theſe caſes, *that* ſhould have been uſed.

The pronoun *that* alſo follows *the ſame* more naturally than *who* or *which*. *He is the ſame man that you ſaw before.* But if a prepoſition muſt precede the relative, there is a kind of neceſſity to replace *who* or *which*; becauſe the pronoun *that* does not admit of ſuch a conſtruction. *His ſubjects looked on his fate with* the ſame *indifference*, to which they *ſaw him totally abandoned.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 52.

Who is uſed in a very peculiar manner in one familiar phraſe; as *who ſhall ſay*, i. e. as *if one, or ſome perſon ſhould ſay.*

When in the firſt of a ſeries of clauſes, the relative *who* has been underſtood, it is aukward to introduce it towards the end of the ſentence. *The Scots, without a head, without union among themſelves, attached, all of them, to different competitors, whoſe title they had raſhly ſubmitted to the deciſion of this foreign uſurper, and* who *were thereby reduced to an abſolute dependence upon him, could only expect by reſiſtance, to intail upon themſelves and their poſterity, a more grievous, and deſtructive ſervitude.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 262.

Whatever relative be uſed, in one of a ſeries of clauſes, relating to the ſame antecedent,

tecedent, the ſame ought to be uſed in them all. *It is remarkable, that Holland, againſt* which *the war was undertaken, and* that, *in the very beginning, was reduced to the brink of deſtruction, loſt nothing.* Univerſal Hiſtory, vol. 25. p. 117. It ought to have been, *and which in the very beginning.*

III. *Of the Oblique Caſes of Pronouns.*

I prefer the term *oblique caſe* of Dr. Johnſon to *objective caſe*, which Dr. Lowth uſes. By the old grammarians, the nominative caſe was called *rectus*, being compared to a line ſtanding upright; and all the other caſes, being formed by *inflexions*, or *bending* from it, were called *oblique*. Now the *objective* caſe can only ſtand for the *accuſative*, in which the object of an affirmative ſentence is put; but *oblique* comprehends other relations, and other caſes, in which this form of the pronoun is uſed; as, *of me, to me, from me.*

Contrary, as it evidently is, to the analogy of the language, the nominative caſe is ſometimes found after verbs and prepoſitions. It has even crept into writing. *The chaplain intreated my comrade and* I *to dreſs as well as poſſible.* World diſplayed, vol. 1. p. 163. *He told my Lord and* I. Fair American, vol. 1. p. 141. This awkward conſtruction is

is conſtantly obſerved by the author of this romance. On the other hand, he ſometimes uſes the oblique caſe inſtead of the nominative. *My father and him have been very intimate ſince.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 53. This laſt is a French conſtruction.

In one familiar phraſe, the pronoun *me* ſeems to be uſed in the nominative, and as it were, in the third perſon too; but the pronoun and the verb make but one word. *Methinks already* I *your tears ſurvey.* Pope. The word *methought* is alſo uſed with reſpect to time paſt; and even *methoughts.* Female Foundling, vol. 1. p. 30.

The nominative caſe is uſed by Shakeſpeare for the oblique, but it ſeems to be in a droll humorous way. *To poor* we *thy enmity is moſt capital,* i. e. *to us poor wretches.*

The pronoun *whoever* and *whoſoever* have ſometimes a double conſtruction, in imitation of the French idiom. *Elizabeth publickly threatened, that ſhe would have the head of* whoever *had adviſed it.* Hume. *He offered a great recompenſe to* whomſoever *would help him to a ſight of him.* Ib.

The pronoun *whoever*, ſeems, ſometimes, to require two verbs; and if only one follow, there ſeems to be a defect in the ſentence. *They frequently emit a poiſonous juice, whereof* whoever *drinks, that perſon's brain flies*

flies out of his noſtrils. Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 60.

All our grammarians ſay, that the nominative caſes of pronouns ought to follow the verb ſubſtantive as well as precede it; yet many familiar forms of ſpeech, and the example of ſome of our beſt writers, would lead us to make a contrary rule; or, at leaſt, would leave us at liberty to adopt which we liked beſt. *Are theſe the houſes you were ſpeaking of? Yes, they are* them. *Who is there? It is* me. *It is* him, *&c. It is not* me *you are in love with.* Addiſon. *It cannot be* me. Swift. *To that which once was* thee. Prior. *There is but one man that ſhe can have, and that is* me. Clariſſa.

When the word *if* begins a ſentence, it ſeems pretty clear, that no perſon, whoſe attention to artificial rules did not put a ſenſible reſtraint upon his language, would ever uſe the nominative caſe after the verb *to be.* Who would not ſay, *If it be* me, rather than *If it be* I.

The word *become* is a verb neuter, as well as the verb *to be*; and I think that no perſon, who reads the following ſentence will queſtion the propriety of the uſe of the oblique caſe after it. *By imagination we place ourſelves in his ſituation, we conceive ourſelves enduring all the ſame torments, we enter, as it were, into his body, and become, in ſome meaſure, him, and from thence form ſome idea of*

of his ſenſations, and even feel ſomething which, tho' weaker in degree, is not altogether unlike them. Smith's Moral Sentiments, p. 2.

It is, likewiſe, ſaid, that the nominative caſe ought to follow the prepoſition *than*; becauſe the verb *to be* is underſtood after it; As, *You are taller than he*, and not *taller than him*; becauſe at full length, it would be, *You are taller than he is*; but ſince it is allowed, that the oblique caſe ſhould follow prepoſitions; and ſince the comparative degree of an adjective, and the particle *than* have, certainly, between them, the force of a prepoſition, expreſſing the relation of one word to another, they ought to require the oblique caſe of the pronoun following; ſo that *greater than me*, will be more grammatical than *greater than I*. Examples, however, of this conſtruction, occur in very good writers. *The Jeſuits had more intereſt at court* than him. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 9. p. 141. *Tell the Cardinal that I underſtand poetry better* than him. Ib. vol. 8. p. 187. *An inhabitant of Crim Tartary was far more happy* than him. Ib. vol. 6. p. 89.

Perhaps theſe authorities, and the univerſal propenſity which may be perceived in all perſons, as well thoſe who have had a learned and polite education, as thoſe who have not, to theſe forms of ſpeech, may make it at leaſt doubtful, whether they be

not agreeable to the true Engliſh idiom. It appears to me, that the chief objection our grammarians have to both theſe forms, is that they are not agreeable to the idiom of the Latin tongue, which is certainly an argument of little weight, as that language is fundamentally different from ours: whereas thoſe forms of expreſſion, are perfectly analogous to the French, and other modern European languages. In theſe the ſame form of a pronoun is never uſed both before and after the verb ſubſtantive. Thus the French ſay, *c'eſt moi, c'eſt lui*; and not *c'eſt je c'eſt il.*

Sometimes, in imitation of the French, the Engliſh authors uſe the oblique caſe for the nominative. *His wealth and* him *bid adieu to each other.*

In ſeveral caſes, as in thoſe abovementioned, the principles of our language are vague, and unſettled. The cuſtom of ſpeaking draws one way, and an attention to arbitrary and artificial rules another. Which will prevail at laſt, it is impoſſible to ſay. It is not the authority of any one perſon, or of a few, be they ever ſo eminent, that can eſtabliſh one form of ſpeech in preference to another. Nothing but the general practice of good writers, and good ſpeakers can do it.

When

When the pronoun precedes the verb, or the participle by which its caſe is determined, it is very common, eſpecially in converſation, to uſe the nominative caſe where the rules of grammar require the oblique. As, Who *is this* for? Who *ſhould I* meet *the other day but my old friend.* Spectator No. 32. This form of ſpeaking is ſo familiar, that I queſtion whether grammarians ſhould not admit it as an exception to the general rule. Dr. Lowth ſays, that grammar requires us to ſay, Whom *do you think me to be.* But in converſation we always hear, Who *do you think me to be.*

SECTION V.

Of VERBS.

I. Of Verbs in general.

THERE is a peculiar ſolemnity in the termination *th* of the third perſon ſingular of the preſent tenſe of verbs, owing, perhaps, to its being more antient than the termination *s*, which is a corruption of *th*, and which is now become more

familiar. *He loveth righteouſneſs, and hateth iniquity.* *Hath* and *doth* are, for this reaſon, more ſolemn than *has* and *does*.

Some of our later writers uſe certain neuter verbs, as if they were tranſitive, putting after them the oblique caſe of the pronoun, which was the nominative caſe to it, agreeable to the French conſtruction of reciprocal verbs; but this cuſtom is ſo foreign to the idiom of the Engliſh tongue, that I think it can never take generally, Repenting him *of his deſign*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 56. *The king ſoon found reaſon to* repent him *of his provoking ſuch dangerous enemies*. Ib. vol. I. p. 121. *The popular lords did not fail to* enlarge themſelves *on the ſubject*. Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 177. *The nearer his military ſucceſſes* approached him *to the throne*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 383.

In the following ſentences, on the contrary, there is a want of the reciprocal form; a verb active and tranſitive being uſed as a verb neuter. *Providence gives us notice, by ſenſible declenſions, that we may* diſengage *from the world by degrees*. Collier. i. e. *diſengage ourſelves*.

On the other hand, verbs neuter are often uſed as if they were active and tranſitive, without being uſed in a reciprocal conſtruction.

conſtruction. *Henry knew, that an excommunication could not fail of* operating *the moſt dangerous effects.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 2. p. 165. Bargaining *their prince for money.* Ib. vol. 7. p. 80. *With a view of* enterpriſing *ſome new violence.* Ib. p. 387. *All cauſes, with regard to the revenue, are* appealed *ultimately to the magiſtrates.* Hume's political Eſſays, p. 258. *A parliament* forfeited *all thoſe who had borne arms againſt the king.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 2. p. 223. *The practice of* forfeiting *ſhips which had been wrecked.* Ib. vol. 1. p. 500.

We have one word, which is uſed as a verb in one ſingle conſtruction, but which is very unlike a verb in other reſpects; *I had as* lief *ſay a thing after him as after another.* Lowth's Anſwer to Warburton, i. e. *I ſhould as ſoon chuſe to ſay.* This is a colloquial and familiar phraſe, and is not often found in writing. We have ſeveral other remarkable contractions for verbs and ſentences. *Good, my Lord, conſider with yourſelf, the difficulty of this ſcience.* Law tracts, vol. 1. p. 131. i. e. *I beg of you, my Lord.* The phraſe is not common, and low.

There is ſomething very ſingular in the uſe and conſtruction of the verb *ail.* We ſay, *what ails him, he ails ſomething*, or *he ails nothing*; but not, *he ails a fever*, or *a fever ails him.*

It is remarkable, that we have one ſingle inſtance of a proper imperative mood, in the firſt perſon plural; but I believe it is not known except in the Yorkſhire dialect. It is *gâ*, which ſignifies, *let us go*, *eamus*.

The old verb *behoved* is generally uſed impersonally, with the pronoun *it* preceding it; but ſome perſons affect to give it a proper nominative caſe. *In order to reach our globe* they the (genii) behoved *to have wings*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 16. p. 156. that is, *it behoved them to have wings*. *But as this ſignal revolution in* the criminal law behoved *to be galling to individuals, unaccuſtomed to reſtrain their paſſions, all meaſures were taken to make the yoke eaſy*. Law Tracts, vol. 1. p. 96, that is, *were neceſſarily galling*, or *could not but be galling*. I think this conſtruction, which is by no means Engliſh, is peculiar to Scotland.

The verb *irks* is only uſed impersonally; as, *it irks me*, which is nearly equivalent to *it grieves me*.

In ſome very familiar forms of ſpeech, the active ſeems to be put for the paſſive form of verbs and participles. *I'll teach you all what's* owing *to your Queen*. Dryden. *The books continue ſelling*, i. e. *upon the ſale*, or *to be ſold*. It may be ſuppoſed, that this inſtance is a contracted form of ſpeaking, the word ending in *ing*, being a noun, and the

the preposition being understood; so we say, *the brass is forging*, i. e. *at the forging*, or *in the act of forging*. But the following sentences are not so easily explained; *They are to blame*, i. e *to be blamed*. *The books are to bind*, i. e. *to be bound*. In the phrase, *he may be still to seek for a thing*, the sense seems to require, that the ellipsis be supplied by reading *he may still be in a condition to seek it*, or *in a state of seeking it*, i. e. *he may not yet have found what he was seeking*.

In some familiar phrases, the subject and object of an affirmation seem to be transposed. We say, He is *well* read *in history*, when we mean that history is well read by him. They were asked *a question*, i. e. *a question was asked them*. They were offered *twenty shillings*, i e. *twenty shillings were offered them*. *They were offered a pardon*, i. e. *a pardon was offered to them*. This inversion of the nominative case, as it may be called, may sometimes make a person pause, a little, before he finds the true sense of a passage. *During his residence abroad, he had acquired immense riches, and* had been left, *by a friend, no less than eighty thousand*

thouſand pounds, to take the name of Melmoth. Louiſa Mildmay, vol. 2. p. 222.

When verbs end in *s*, *ſe*, *ſs*, *p*, and ſome other letters, the preter tenſe, and participles, in the manner in which we generally pronounce words in Engliſh, end as if the final letter was *t*; but it does not look well to make any abridgment in writing, and much leſs to ſpell the word with a *t*. Theſe contractions, however, have been made by good writers. *Diſperſt.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 390. *Diſtreſt.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 224. *Dropt.* Ib. vol. 4. p. 408. *Talkt.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 295. *Checkt.* Ib. p. 297. *Aſkt.* Ib. p. 305. *His face* ſtampt *upon their coins.* Addiſon. Enwrapt *in thoſe ſtudies.* Pope, and Arbuthnot. *He* paſt *four months.* Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 28. Heapt *up greater honours.* Addiſon. In verſe, this contraction is more allowable; Rapt *into future times, the bard begun.* Pope's Meſſiah.

The verb *ought* is not enumerated among the auxiliary verbs, becauſe it does not connect with the other verbs, without the intervention of the particle *to*. It is an imperfect verb, for it has no other modification beſides this one.

The verb *muſt*, which was enumerated among the auxiliaries, is equally imperfect, and is likewiſe of the preſent tenſe only. It is, therefore, improperly introduced

duced into a ſentence which relates wholly to time paſt. Muſt *it not be expected, that the king would defend an authority, which had been exerciſed without diſpute or controverſy.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 311. The meaning is, *might it not have been expected.*

The preſent tenſe is improperly uſed with reſpect to a time, which is mentioned as having a certain limited duration; becauſe the time muſt be paſt or future. *I have compaſſion on the multitude becauſe* they continue *with me, now,* three days. It ſhould have been, *have continued.* Indeed the verb *have* is appropriated to this very uſe. *In the treaſury belonging to the cathedral in this city* is preſerved *with the greateſt veneration, for* upwards of ſix hundred years, *a diſh, or rather an hexagon bowl, which they pretend to be made of emerald.* Condamine's Travels. p. 15. *It is at Rome, that* it is cultivated *with the greateſt ſucceſs, and eſpecially for* upwards of a century paſt. Ib. p. 43. *I remember him theſe many years.* Engliſh Merchant.

An ambiguity is occaſioned in our language when the preter tenſe of one verb happens to be the preſent tenſe of another. I fell *a tree now.* I fell *down yeſterday,* from the verb *to fall. I* lay *a thing down to day: I* lay *down yeſterday,* from the verb *to lie.*

The termination *eſt*, annexed to the preter tenſes of verbs, is, at beſt, a very harſh one, when it is contracted, according to our general cuſtom, by throwing out the *e*; as *learnedſt*, for *learnedeſt*; and eſpecially, if it be again contracted into one ſyllable, as it is commonly pronounced, and made *learndſt*. Some forms of the preter tenſes, where they are always contracted in the firſt perſon, do not admit of any more contraction, or the addition of any more conſonants to their terminations, and therefore may be properly enough ſaid to have no ſecond perſons ſingular at all. I believe a writer, or ſpeaker would have recourſe to any periphraſis rather than ſay *kepteſt*, or *keptſt*, which are the only words that can be ſuppoſed to be the ſecond perſons in the tenſe *I kept*. Or, in what manner would the termination of the ſecond perſon be annexed to the word *dreamed*, or as it is generally pronounced, *dreamt*. Indeed this harſh termination *eſt* is generally quite dropped in common converſation, and ſometimes by the poets, in writing. *Nor thou that* flings for *flingeſt*, or, *flingſt*) *me floundering from thy back.* Frogs and Mice, line 123.

II. *Of*

II. *Of the Conjunctive Form of Verbs.*

The word *had* is frequently uſed inſtead of *would have*, in which caſe it has all the force of a conjunctive form of a verb. *He* had *been Diogenes if he had not been Alexander*, i. e. *would have been, &c.* The verb *had* in this ſenſe precedes its nominative caſe, and the particle implying doubt or uncertainty is omitted. Had *he done this he would have eſcaped*; i. e. *if he had done this. No landholder would have been at that expence*, had he *not been ſure of the ſale of his commodities*. Poſtlethwaite on Commerce, p. 123.

There ſeems to be a peculiar elegance in a ſentence beginning with the conjunctive form of a verb. Were *there no difference, there would be no choice*. Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 208.

A double conjunctive, in two correſponding clauſes of a ſentence, is ſtill more elegant. *He* had *formed one of the moſt ſhining characters of his age*, had *not the extreme narrowneſs of his genius, in every thing but war, diminiſhed the luſtre of his merits*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 28. The ſentence in the common form would not have read near ſo well. *He would*

would have formed, &c. *if the extreme narrowneſs of his genius*, &c. *had not*, &c. Had *the limitations on the prerogative been, in his time, quite fixed, and certain, his integrity* had *made him regard as ſacred, the boundaries of the conſtitution.* Ib. p. 151.

Sometimes the particles expreſſing ſuppoſition are omitted before the conjunctive form of verbs, this form itſelf ſufficiently expreſſing uncertainty. Were *thoſe letters to fall into the hands of ſome ingenious perſons.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 5. i. e. *If theſe letters were to fall*, &c.

The conjunctive form may take place after the adverb *perhaps*. *Perhaps it were to be wiſhed, that, in baniſhing from the pulpit that falſe taſte, whereby it had been ſo long debaſed, he had alſo ſuppreſſed the cuſtom of preaching from one text.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 9. p. 5.

Dr. *Johnſon* aſſigns no conjunctive form to the *preter tenſe:* but the analogy of the language ſeems to require that both the tenſes be put upon a level in this reſpect.—It ſeems to be uſed with propriety only when ſome degree of *doubt* or *heſitation* is implied; ſince when an event is looked upon as abſolutely certain, though in ſpeaking of it we make uſe of the conjunctive particles, *&c.* the uſual change of terminations is retained: to give a familiar

familiar example of this; we ſhould ſay, in purſuing a perſon, *We ſhould overtake him though* he run; not knowing whether he did run or no; whereas upon ſeeing him run, we ſhould ſay, *We ſhall overtake him though* he runneth, or *runs*.

Almoſt all the irregularities in the conſtruction of any language ariſe from the *ellipſis* of ſome words which were originally inſerted in the ſentence, and made it regular; let us endeavour to explain this manner of ſpeaking, by tracing out the original ellipſis. May we not ſuppoſe that the word *run* in this ſentence, is in the *radical form* (which anſwers to the *infinitive mood* in other languages) requiring regularly to be preceded by another verb expreſſing doubt or uncertainty, and the intire ſentence to be, *We ſhall overtake him though he* ſhould *run*.

It is an objection, however, to this account of the origin of the conjunctive form of verbs, at leaſt, an objection againſt extending it to the preter tenſe; that, if we analize a conjunctive preterite, by ſupplying the ellipſis, the rule will not appear to hold, except when the preter tenſe and the participle are the ſame, as indeed they are in all verbs regularly inflected. *If thou loved*, may be rendered, *If thou ſhouldeſt have loved*, or *If thou hadſt*

hadſt loved; but *if thou drew*, would be, *If thou hadſt drawn.*

That the conjunctive form of verbs is, however, in fact uſed for the auxiliary and another form of the verb, is evident from a variety of examples. *What a ſchool of private and public virtue* had been *opened to us, after the reſurrection of letters, if the late hiſtorians of the Roman commonwealth, and the firſt of the ſucceeding monarchy, had come down to us entire. Would have been opened* makes exactly the ſame ſenſe. *Many acts, which* had been *blameable in a peaceable government, were employed to detect conſpiracies.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 261. i. e. *would have been blameable.*

Theſe examples are exactly ſimilar to the following, which is, undeniably, in what I call the conjunctive form. *They affirmed, that* it were *injuſtice to deny the execution of the law to any individual*, i. e. *that it would be injuſtice*, &c.

This conjunctive forms of verbs, though our forefathers paid a pretty ſtrict regard to it, is much neglected by many of our beſt writers. *If he* chances *to think right, he knows not how to convey his thoughts to another, with clearneſs and perſpicuity.* Addiſon.

So

So little is this form of verbs attended to, that few writers are quite uniform in their own practice with reſpect to it. We even ſometimes, find both the forms of a verb in the ſame ſentence, and in the ſame conſtruction. *If a man* prefer *a life of induſtry, it is becauſe he has an idea of happineſs in wealth; if he* prefers *a life of gaiety, it is from a like idea concerning pleaſure.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 124. *No reaſonable man, whether whig or tory, can be of opinion for continuing the war, upon the foot it now is, unleſs he* be *a gainer by it, and* hopes, *it may occaſion ſome new turn of affairs at home, to the advantage of his party; or unleſs he be very ignorant of the kingdom's condition, and by what means we have been reduced to it.* Swift's Preface, to the Conduct of the Allies.

Grammatical as this conjunctive form of verbs is ſaid to be, by all who write upon the ſubject, it muſt, I think, be acknowledged, that it ſometimes gives the appearance of ſtiffneſs, and harſhneſs to a ſentence. *That no pretenſions to ſo illuſtrious a character, ſhould by any means be received before that operation* were *performed.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 55. *We ſhould owe little to that ſtateſman, who* were *to contrive a defence, that might ſuperſede*

ſede the external uſe of virtue. Ferguſon's Hiſtory of Civil Society, p. 92.

Originally, the two forms of the verb *to be* were uſed promiſcuouſly. *We be twelve brethren.* Geneſis.

III. *Of Participles.*

To avoid a colliſion of vowels, the *e* is omitted before *i* in participles of the preſent tenſe; as, *love*, *loving*. On the other hand, the final conſonant is doubled in the ſame caſe; and indeed before any other addition to the termination, when it is preceded by a ſingle vowel, and when, if it conſiſt of two ſyllables, the accent would be on the latter of them; as, *get*, *getting*, *getteth*; *forget*, *forgetting*, *forgetteth*.

Many participles, loſing the idea of time, which was originally annexed to them, become, in all reſpects, mere adjectives; as *charming youth*, *a loving couple*. *A regular formed ſervitude.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 105. *A* formed deſign *to ſubvert the conſtitution.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 285. *A ſettled deſign.* Ib. vol. 7. p. 86. *A well appointed army.* Ib. vol. 7. p. 466. There is great elegance in ſome of theſe adjectives, made out of participles.

In

In this caſe, the termination *ed* is commonly contracted, and the words are made to end in *t*; as, *time paſt*, from *paſſed*. Sometimes the termination *ed* is dropped entirely, when the verb itſelf ended in *t*, and when the words have wholly loſt their original uſe as participles; as, *content*, *correct*, *corrupt*, &c.

Many nouns are derived from verbs, and end in *ing*, like the participles of the preſent tenſe. The difference between theſe nouns and participles is often overlooked, and the accurate diſtinction of the two ſenſes not attended to. If I ſay, *What think you of my* horſe's running *to-day*, I uſe the noun *running*, and ſuppoſe the horſe to have actually run; for it is the ſame thing as if I had ſaid, *What think you of the running of my horſe*. But if I ſay, *What think you of my* horſe running *to-day*, I uſe the participle, and I mean to aſk, whether it be proper that my horſe ſhould run or not; which, therefore, ſuppoſes that he had not then run.

Some of our early poets preſerve the *y*, as the remains of the Saxon *ge*, prefixed to many participles. Thus Spencer writes, *ypight* for *pitched*.

Some of our participles ſeem to have been more irregular formerly than they are now; as, beſides the example above-mentioned

mentioned, Spencer, writes *ſhright* for *ſhrieked*.

Formerly the *d*, which terminates participles preterite, was often dropped, when the verb ended in *e*. *They are* confederate *againſt thee*. Pſalms. This form of the participle is ſtill common among the Scots. *They engaged the biſhops to pronounce Gaviſton* excommunicate, *if he remained any longer in the kingdom*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 341. The word *ſituate*, is often uſed, and eſpecially by lawyers, for *ſituated*. Milton ſometimes uſes this form, as *elevate* for *elevated*.

As the *paucity of inflections* is the greateſt defect in our language, we ought to take advantage of every variety that the practice of good authors will warrant; and, therefore, if poſſible, make a *participle* different from the *preterite* of a verb; as, a book is *written*, not *wrote*; the ſhips are *taken*, not *took*.

This rule, however, has, by no means, been ſufficiently attend to by good writers. *It was not* wrote *on parchment*. Hume's Eſſays, p. 262. *The court of Auguſtus had not yet* wore *off the manners of the republic*. Ib. p. 182. *You who have* forſook *them*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 18. p. 27. *Who have* bore *a part in the progreſs*. Ferguſon on Civil Society, p. 261.

In

In ſome caſes, the cuſtom of leaving out the *n*, in the termination of participles, hath prevailed ſo long, that it ſeems too late to attempt to reſtore it. Thus the word *broke* ſeems almoſt to have excluded *broken*. *Whenever a ſtanding rule of law hath being wantonly* broke *in upon*. Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. 1. p. 70. *Their line of princes was continually* broke. Hume's Eſſays, p. 302.

Bolingbroke affects a difference in ſpeling the preter tenſes and participles of verbs, when they are the ſame in ſound with the preſent tenſe. *The late Duke of Marlborough never* red *Xenophon, moſt certainly*. Bolingbroke on hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 26. *I remember to have* red. Ib. p. 68. This inſtance is particularly bad, on account of the adjective being likewiſe ſpelled *red*. *Wherever Chriſtianity has* ſpred. Ib. p. 92. Mr. Hume ſpells the preterite in the ſame manner. *Such illuſtrious examples* ſpred *knowledge every where, and begat an univerſal eſteem for the ſciences*. Hume's Eſſays, p. 282.

Bolingbroke, in one place, ſeems to affect a variety in the participles of the ſame verb, when they happen to come too near together. *He will endeavour to write as the antient author would have* wrote, *had he* writ *in the ſame language*. Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1, p. 68.

The

The affectation of uſing the preterite tenſe inſtead of the participle, which is common, I think, in the dialect of London, is peculiarly aukward; as, *he has came*. This has ſometimes crept into writing. *If ſome events had not* fell *out*. Poſtlethwaite on Commerce, Pref. p. 11.

Different participles of the ſame verb are ſometimes uſed in different ſenſes. Thus we ſay, *a man is hanged*; but *the coat is hung up*.

There is a remarkable ambiguity in the uſe of the participle preterite, as the ſame word may expreſs a thing either doing, or done. *I went to ſee the child dreſſed*, may either mean, I went to ſee the child whilſt they were putting on his cloaths, or when they were put on.

IV. *Of the Auxiliary Verbs.*

It is often unneceſſary to repeat the principal verb after an auxiliary, when it has been uſed before in the ſame ſentence, and the ſame conſtruction. *I have read that author, but* you have *not*. *He loves not plays, as* thou doſt, *Antony*. Shakeſpeare.

By ſtudying conciſeneſs we are apt to drop the auxiliary *to have*, though the ſenſe relate to the time paſt. *I found him better than*

than I expected to find him. In this caſe, analogy ſeems to require that we ſay, *than I expected to have found him.* i. e. *to have found him* then. On the other hand, as the time paſt is ſufficiently indicated in the former part of the ſentence, and *to find* may be ſaid to be indefinite with reſpect to time, the repetition of the auxiliary will perhaps, by ſome, be thought awkward, and unneceſſary.

In many caſes, however, writers are certainly faulty in omitting this auxiliary. *Theſe proſecutions of William,* ſeem to be *the moſt iniquitous meaſures purſued by the court, during the time that the uſe of parliaments was ſuſpended.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 241. *To have been,* is what the ſenſe of this paſſage requires. *The following converſation is, in its kind, ſomewhat uncommon; and, for this reaſon, I have remembered it more minutely than* I could imagine. Harris, i. e. *I could have imagined.*

Notwithſtanding this, when the word *have* occurs more than once in a ſentence, it ſeems to embarraſs it, and one of them ſeems to be ſuperfluous; though, both of them being uſed in the ſame conſtruction, and relating to the ſame time, there ſeems to be an equal propriety in them both. The following ſentences do not, on this account, read well, though they may be ſtrictly grammatical. *Hiſtory painters would* have

have *found it difficult, to* have *invented ſuch a ſpecies of beings, when they were obliged to put a moral virtue into colours.* Addiſon on Medals. *The girl ſaid, if her maſter would but* have *let her* had *money, ſhe* have *ſent for proper advice, and broths, and jellies, and ſuch like, ſhe might* have *been well long ago.* George Villiers, vol. 2. p. 90.

It ſeems not to have been determined by the Engliſh grammarians, whether the paſſive participles of verbs neuter require the auxiliary *am* or *have* before them. The French, in this caſe, confine themſelves ſtrictly to the former. *If ſuch maxims, and ſuch practices prevail, what* has become *of national liberty.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol 6. p. 254. The French would ſay, *what is become;* and in this inſtance, perhaps, with more propriety. Yet I think we have an advantage in the choice of theſe two forms of expreſſion, as it appears to me, that we uſe them to expreſs different modifications of the ſenſe. When I ſay, *I am fallen,* I mean at this preſent inſtant; whereas, if I ſay, *I have fallen,* my meaning comprehends, indeed, the foregoing; but has, likewiſe, a ſecret reference to ſome period of time paſt, as *ſome time in this day,* or *in this hour, I have fallen*; implying ſome continuance of time, which the other form of expreſſion does not.

The

The conditional form of the verbs *ſhall*, &c. is uſed with reſpect to time paſt, preſent, and future. We ſay, *I ſhould have gone yeſterday*, and *I ſhould go to day*; or *to-morrow*; but the abſolute form *I ſhall*, always reſpects time to come.

Sometimes that form of the auxiliary verbs *ſhall*, *will*, *may*, and *can*, which is generally conditional, is elegantly uſed to expreſs a very ſlight aſſertion, with a modeſt diffidence. Thus we ſay, *I ſhould think*; that is, *I am rather inclined to think*. *The general report is, that* he ſhould have ſaid *in confidence to Clifford, that if he was ſure the young man who appeared in Flanders was really ſon to king Edward, he never would bear arms againſt him.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 383. *The royal power, it ſhould ſeem, might be intruſted in their hands.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 217.

The auxiliary verb *ſhall* reverts to its original ſignification in its conditional form, when *if*, or any other particle expreſſing uncertainty, is prefixed to it. *I ſhould go*, means I ought to go; but *if I ſhould go*, means *if it happen that I go*. This obſervation is Dr. Johnſon's.

This conditional form of theſe verbs, at the beginning of a ſentence, has often the force of a ſtrong wiſh, or imprecation. In this ſenſe it is generally found in conjunction with the word *to*. Would to heaven,

young

young man, I knew you. Fair American, vol. 1. p. 28 that is, *by heaven, I wiſh I knew you.* But ſometimes we find it without the particle *to. Mine Eyes are open now*; would *Zopir, thine were too*, Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 25. p. 35. Would, *that kind heaven had taken my wretched life*. Ib. vol. 28. p. 49.

The Scots ſtill uſe *ſhall* and *will*, *ſhould* and *would*, as they were formerly uſed in England; i. e. in a ſenſe quite contrary to that in which they are uſed with us at preſent. *We* would *have been wanting to ourſelves, if we did continue to pay a ſubſidy, for which there was no neceſſity.* Conduct of the Whigs and Tories examined. *We* will *therefore, briefly unfold the reaſons which induce us to believe, that this nation really enjoyed a conſiderable trade before this auſpicious reign. We will next ſhow what thoſe difficulties were, under which our commerce laboured under the reign preceding that; and, laſtly, we* will *give a ſhort account how thoſe advantages aroſe, of which we have been ſince poſſeſſed.* Preceptor, vol. 2. p. 413. *By ſuch gradual innovations the king flattered himſelf that he* would *quietly introduce epiſcopal authority.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 22. *He imagined, that by playing one party againſt the other, he* would *eaſily obtain the victory over both*, Ib. vol. 8. p. 250.

In ſeveral familiar forms of expreſſion, the word *ſhall* ſtill retains its original ſignification, and does not mean to promiſe, threaten,

threaten, or engage, in the third perſon, but the mere futurition of an event; as, *This is as extraordinary a thing as one* ſhall *ever hear of.* This ſenſe is alſo retained by our beſt writers in the graveſt ſtyle. *Whoever* will *examine the writings of all kinds, wherewith this antient ſect hath honoured the world,* ſhall *immediately find from the whole thread and tenor of them, that the ideas of the authors have been altogether converſant, and taken up with the faults, and blemiſhes, and overſights, and miſtakes of other writers.* Swift. It ſhould ſeem that both the words *ſhall* and *will* might be ſubſtituted for one another in this paſſage, without any injury to the ſenſe. *Put this reverſe now, if you pleaſe, into the hands of a muſical antiquary,* he ſhall *tell you, that the uſe of the ſhield, being to defend the body from the weapons of an enemy, it very aptly ſhadows out to us the reſolution, or continence of the emperor.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 31.

When a queſtion is aſked, the verb *ſhall,* in the firſt perſon, is uſed in a ſenſe different from both its other ſenſes. *Shall I write,* means, *Is it your pleaſure that I ſhould write?* *Will,* in the ſecond perſon, only reverts to its other uſual ſenſe; for, *Will you write,* means, *Is it your intention to write?*

When the word *will* is no auxiliary, but is uſed by itſelf, to expreſs volition, it is inflected regularly, like other verbs. *Nor is the ſubtle air leſs obedient to thy power, whether* thou willeſt *it to be a miniſter to our pleaſure, or utility.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 39.

In aſking a queſtion, the auxiliary verb *may* is ſometimes uſed without any regard to its general meaning, but only, as it were, to ſoften the boldneſs there might be in an inquiry; as, *How old may you be*, &c.

When the prepoſition *to* ſignifies *in order to*, it uſed to be preceded by *for*, which is now almoſt obſolete; *What went you out* for to *ſee.* This exactly correſponds to the uſe which the French make of *pour.*

The particle *for* before the infinitive, is not, in all caſes, obſolete. It is uſed if the ſubject of the affirmation intervene between that prepoſition and the verb. For *holy perſons* to be *humble, is as hard, as* for *a prince to ſubmit himſelf* to be *guided by tutors.* Taylor.

The verb *dare* is ſometimes uſed without the prepoſition *to* after it, as if it was an auxiliary verb. *Who* durſt defy *the Omnipotent to arms.* Milton. *Who have* dared defy *the worſt.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 200. *I dare ſwear you think my letter already long*

long enough. Lady Montague's Letters, vol. 1. p. 6. *I had a good deal of courage to* dare mount *him.* This conſtruction, however, does not ſeem natural, except in ſuch familiar expreſſions as *I dare ſay, I dare go,* and the like. It muſt, I ſuppoſe, be according to the Scotch idiom, that Mrs. Macaulay omits it after the verb *help. Laud was promoted as an uſeful inſtrument to* help carry *on the new meaſures of the court.* Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 150.

SECTION IV.

Of Adverbs and Conjunctions.

MANY adverbs admit of degrees of compariſon as well as adjectives, and for the ſame reaſon; as, *ſoon, ſooner, ſooneſt; well, better, beſt; often, oftener, oftneſt.*

In imitation of the French idiom, the adverb of place *where* is often uſed inſtead of the pronoun relative, and a prepoſition. *They framed a proteſtation,* where *they repeated all their former claims.* Hume's Hiſtory. i. e. in which *they repeated, The king was ſtill determined to run forwards in the ſame courſe*

where *he was already, by his precipitate career, too fatally advanced.* Ib. i. e. in which *he was.*

The adverbs *hence, thence,* and *whence,* imply a preposition; for they signify, *from this place from that place, from what place.* It seems, therefore, to be improper to join a preposition along with them, because it is superfluous; yet the practice is very common. *This is the leviathan,* from whence *the terrible wits of our age are said to borrow their weapons.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 10. *An ancient author propheſies* from hence. Dryden. Indeed the origin of theſe words is ſo little attended to, and the preposition *from* ſo often uſed in conſtruction with them, that the omiſſion of it in many caſes would ſeem ſtiff and diſagreeable.

We have ſome examples of adverbs being uſed for ſubſtantives. *In* 1687, *Innocent the eleventh erected it into a community of regulars, ſince* when *it has begun to increaſe in thoſe countries as a religious order.* Ulloa's Voyage, vol. 1. p. 270. i. e. *ſince which time.* A little while, *and I ſhall not ſee you,* i. e. *a ſhort time. It is worth their* while, i. e. *it deſerves their time and pains.* But this uſe of the word rather ſuits familiar and low ſtyle. The ſame may be ſaid of

of the phraſe, *to do a thing* any how. i. e. *in any manner*; or, *ſome how*, i. e. *in ſome manner*. Somehow, *worthy as theſe people are, they look upon public penance as diſreputable*. Louiſa Mildmay, vol. 2. p. 175.

The adverb *how* is ſometimes uſed in a particular ſenſe, implying a negative. *Let us take care* how *we ſin*, i. e. *Let us take care that we do not ſin*. The ſame conſtruction has not, however, always the ſame ſenſe. *Take care* how *ye hear*, i. e. *in what manner ye hear*.

Sometimes this adverb *how* is equivalent to the conjunction *that*. *It has been matter of aſtoniſhment to me*, how *ſuch perſons could take ſo many ſilly pains to eſtabliſh myſtery on metaphyſics*. Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 175. i. e. *that ſuch perſons*——

Adverbs are more often put for adjectives, agreeable to the idiom of the Greek tongue. *The action was* amiſs, *the* then *miniſtry*. Conduct of the Whigs and Tories examined *The idea is* alike *in both*. Addiſon on Medals, p. 70. *The* above *diſcourſe*. Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 95.

One uſe of the adverb *there* is pretty remarkable, though common. It is prefixed to a verb, when the nominative caſe follows it; but ſeems to have no meaning whatever,

whatever, except it be thought to give a ſmall degree of emphaſis to the ſentence. There was *a man ſent from God, whoſe name was John*; i. e. a man was ſent.

In ſome caſes, two negative particles were formerly uſed, as in Greek, where we now uſe only one. *And this ſterre, which is toward the northe, that we clippen the lode ſterre,* ne *appeareth* not *to hem.* Maundeville.

When the negative is included in the ſubject of an affirmation, a negative meaning has the appearance of a poſitive one. *I can do nothing*, i. e. *I cannot do any thing.*

The words *no* and *not* are uſed variouſly by our beſt writers, and ſometimes even promiſcuouſly by the ſame writer. *Whether it be ſo or* no. Addiſon. *Hence; whether in imitation of Catullus, or* not, *we apply the ſame thought to the moon.* Ib.

There is a remarkable ambiguity in the uſe of the negative adjective *no*; and I do not ſee how it can be remedied in any language. If I ſay, *no laws are better than the Engliſh*, it is only my known ſentiments that can inform a perſon whether I mean to praiſe, or diſpraiſe them.

It is obſervable, that an anſwer to a queſtion, in Engliſh, is rather a contraction of a ſentence, expreſſing an affirmative or nega-

negative propoſition, and that it does not at all depend on the manner in which the queſtion is aſked. Whether my friend ſay, Are you *diſpoſed to take a walk*; or, Are you not *diſpoſed to take a walk*; if I be diſpoſed to walk, I ſay *yes*; if not, I ſay, *no*.

The word *ſo* has, ſometimes, the ſame meaning with *alſo*, *likewiſe*, *the ſame*; or rather it is equivalent to the univerſal pronoun *le* in French. *They are happy, we are not* ſo, i. e. *not happy*.

Mr. Hume frequently enumerates a great number of particulars without any conjunction whatever between any of them. This conſtruction, though it very happily expreſſes rapidity and energy, ſeems to have a bad effect in plain hiſtorical ſtyle, as it makes a diſagreeable *hiatus*, and diſappoints the reader. *They enacted, that no proclamation ſhould deprive any perſon of his lawful poſſeſſions, liberties, inheritances, privileges, franchiſes; nor yet infringe any common law, or laudable cuſtom of the realm.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 214. *They were commanded by Deſſé, and under him by Andelet, Strozzi, Miellrage, Count Rhingrave.* This conſtruction, where great numbers of proper names occur, is very common with this author.

Sometimes the particles *or*, and *nor*, may, either of them, be uſed with nearly equal propriety. *The king, whoſe character was not ſufficiently vigorous*, nor *deciſive, aſſented to the meaſure.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 102. *Or* would perhaps have been better, but *nor* ſeems to repeat the negation in the former part of the ſentence, and therefore gives more emphaſis to the expreſſion.

The conjunction *as* is ſeldom uſed but in connection with ſome other conjunction, or in dependance upon ſome other word of the ſentence; but, in one caſe, it is uſed ſingly, in the ſame ſenſe as the prepoſition *on*. *The books were to have been ſold*, as *this day*.

That is uſed improperly in the following ſentences, in which the French and not the Engliſh idiom is obſerved. *The reſolution was not the leſs fixed*, that *the ſecret was as yet communicated to very few, either in the French or the Engliſh court.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 474. *We will not pretend to examine diſeaſes in all their various circumſtances, eſpecially* that *they have not been ſo accurately obſerved or deſcribed by writers of later ages, as were to be wiſhed.* Martine's Eſſays, p. 29. *Though nothing urged by the king's friends on this occaſion had*

any

any connections with the peace, ſecurity and freedom the Scots at this time enjoyed; and that *their propoſal of engaging againſt England manifeſtly tended to the utter deſtruction of theſe bleſſings; yet the forementioned arguments had ſuch weight with the parliament, that a committee of twenty-four members was empowered to provide for the ſafety of the kingdom.* Macaulay's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 377.

In ſeveral caſes we content ourſelves, now, with fewer conjunctive particles than our anceſtors did; particularly, we often leave out the conjunction *as*, when they uſed it, after *ſo*; and the uſe of it in thoſe caſes now appears aukward. *This new aſſociate propoſed abundance of theſe againſt indulgences*, ſo as that *his doctrines were embraced by great numbers.* Univerſal Hiſt. vol. 29. p. 501. *So that* would have been much eaſier, and better.

We want a conjunction adapted to familiar ſtyle, equivalent to *notwithſtanding*. *For all that* ſeems to be too low and vulgar. *A word it was in the mouth of every one, but* for all that, *as to its preciſe and definite idea, this may ſtill be a ſecret.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 5.

In regard that is ſolemn, and antiquated; *becauſe* would do much better in the following ſentence. *The French muſick is diſ-*

liked by all other nations. It cannot be otherwiſe, in regard that *the French proſody differs from that of every other country in Europe*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 9. p. 306.

Except is far preferable to *other than*. *It admitted of no effectual cure*, other than *amputation*. Law tracts, vol. 1. p. 302. and alſo to *all but*. *They aroſe in the morning, and lay down at night, pleaſed with each other, and themſelves*, all but *Raſſelas, who began to withdraw himſelf from their paſtime*. Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 11.

SECTION VII.

Of the Compoſition and Derivation of Words.

WHEN two words are uſed to compoſe one, in order to make one name of a thing, they often coaleſce into one word, and are writen cloſe together; as *glaſshouſe, countryman*. Sometimes an *ſ* is interpoſed between them, the former having been a genitive caſe; as, *Herdſman*; originally *Herd's man*. In other caſes, though the idea be one, the words

words remain quite ſeparate, as *country gentleman*, *grammar ſchool*, *Pendervin caſtle*, *city gates*, &c. Other terms remain in a kind of middle ſtate; and the two words, not perfectly coaleſcing into one, are uſually joined by a hyphen; as, *court-day*, *court-hand*, *knight-errant*, *croſs bar ſhot*; but theſe hyphens are now generally omitted. They are moſt uſed to connect ſome Latin particle, to a word; as *non-conductor*, *non-electric*. It is alſo ſometimes uſed after the prefixes *re* and *pre*, when they are joined to words beginning with an *e*, as, *re-enter*, *pre-eminence*, &c. The hyphen is alſo ſometimes uſed to connect particles to other words, in order to compound the idea; an *unheard-of reſtraint*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 449. *Counter-project*. Swift. Words of this kind are eaſily underſtood, becauſe their meaning out of compoſition is retained when they are compounded. *All-conqueror as I am*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 27. p. 292.

For want of a ſufficient number of terms to expreſs the aſcending and deſcending lines of conſanguity, we aukwardly repeat the word *great* for every generation above grandfather, and below grandſon, as *great great grandfather*, *great great grandſon*, &c.

Prepo-

Prepoſitions are often joined to adverbs, ſo as to make one word with them; as *hereabouts*, *hereafter*, *herein*, &c. but theſe words are now ſeldom uſed, except in formal and ſolemn ſtyle.

A very great number of the moſt common and ſignificant phraſes in our language are made by the addition of a prepoſition to a verb, particularly the Saxon monoſyllabic verbs, as *to get*, *to keep*, *to make*, *to give*, *to caſt*, *to go*, *to hold*, &c. In the caſe of theſe complex terms, the component parts are no guide to the ſenſe of the whole. Thus the common idea annexed to the verb *give* is loſt in the phraſes, *to give up*, *to give out*, *to give over*, &c. This circumſtance contributes greatly towards making our language peculiarly difficult to foreigners.

Notwithſtanding the rules of the compoſition and derivation of words be ever ſo well fixed, cuſtom preſcribes how far we may take advantage of them; and the force of aſſociation of ideas is hardly any where more evident, than in the diſagreeable ſenſation excited by words, which, though perfectly intelligible, have not happened to be adopted by the generality of writers; and eſpecially when eaſier words have happened to ſupply their places.

places. A few examples will make this remark ſtriking. *Damningneſs.* Hammond. *Criminouſneſs.* King Charles. *Deſignleſsly.* Boyle. *Candidneſs.* South. *The naturalneſs of the thought.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 84. *Deſcanting upon the value, rarity, and* authenticalneſs *of the ſeveral pieces that lie before them.* Ib. *The ſcience of medals, which is charged with ſo many* unconcerning *parts of knowledge.* Ib. 84. *Among other* informalities. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 401. *It would be ſuch a* diſobligation *to the prince.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 74. *The* diſlikers *may be forced to fall in with.* Swift's. *To diſcover its ſpirit and* intendment. Law Tracts, Pref. p. 9. *Without any* circuity. Hume. Inſtead of *precipitate,* and *precipitately,* Mr. Hume writes *precipitant.* Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 281. and *precipitantly.* Ib. p. 291. Alſo inſtead of *conſultation,* he uſes *conſult.* Ib. vol. 8. p. 65. *It would be unnatural, and* incumfortable. Law Tracts, vol. 6. p. 125. *It would have been too* impopular *among the Spaniards.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 11.

Latin prefixes and terminations do not well ſuit with Saxon words, and *vice verſa. Diſlikeneſs.* Locke. For this reaſon, *diſquietneſs* is not ſo good a word as *diſquietude,*

tude, or *inquietude*. There are, however, ſeveral exceptions to this obſervation; as the word *genuineneſs*.

I wiſh we had more liberty to introduce new words, by a derivation analogous to others already in uſe, when they are evidently wanted. We have, for inſtance, no term to expreſs a perſon who underſtands mechanics. A *mechanic* is a mere workman. And yet I am afraid that *mechaniſt*, which Mr. Johnſon has introduced in this ſenſe, will not be generally adopted. *Having ſeen what a* mechaniſt *had already performed.* Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 36.

When there are two derivatives from the ſame word, they are apt to ſlide, by degrees into different meanings; a cuſtom which tends greatly to enrich a language. Thus we uſe the word *adheſion* in a literal ſenſe; as when we ſpeak of the adheſion of the lungs to the plural; and we uſe the word *adherence* in a figurative ſenſe only; as when we ſpeak of the adherence of a people to their prince, or to a cauſe. We alſo uſe the word *expoſure* in a little ſenſe, and *expoſition* in a figurative one; yet Mr. Hume ſays, *a fountain which has a* north expoſition. Political Eſſays, p. 219.

Though

Though both the words *propoſal* and *propoſition* be derived from the verb *propoſe*, we now uſe the word *propoſal* to denote a thing that is propoſed to be done, and *propoſition* for an aſſertion propoſed to be proved. Some writers, however, and particularly Mrs. Macaulay, in conformity, perhaps, to the French idiom, uſe the latter in the ſenſe of the former. *This obſervation was followed by* a propoſition, *which had been at firſt ſuggeſted, and was immediately conſented to by the commiſſioners*, Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 312.

The Latin word *extempore* is often uſed without any change, as an Engliſh word. Mr. Hume writes *extemporary*. Hiſt. vol. 6. p. 335.

Derivation is no certain rule to judge of the ſenſe of words. The word *humouriſt* does not ſignify a *man of humour*.

There is an inconvenience in introducing new words by compoſition which nearly reſembles others in uſe before; as, *diſſerve*, which is too much like *deſerve*.

Sec-

SECTION VIII.

Of Articles.

ARTICLES are, ſtrictly ſpeaking, adjectives, as they neceſſarily require a noun ſubſtantive to follow them, the ſignification of which they ſerve to limit and aſcertain, as all adjectives do.

In ſome few caſes, after the manner of the French, we prefix the definite article *the* to the name of towns; as, the *Hague*, the *Havannah*, the *Deviſes*.

Proper names, when they are uſed as common ones, may have an article. *One would take him to be* an *Achilles*. Devil upon Crutches.

The article *a* is made more emphatical by the addition of the adjective *certain*. *A certain man had two ſons*. Luke. But this does not ſeem to ſuit proper names. *At laſt*, a certain *Fitzgerald appeared*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 161. *One Fitzgerald* would have been better.

In uſing proper names, we generally have recourſe to the adjective *one*, to particulariſe them. If I tell my friend, *I have ſeen one Mr. Roberts*, I ſuppoſe the Mr.

Mr. Roberts that I mean to be a ſtranger to him; whereas, if I ſay, *I have ſeen Mr. Roberts*, I ſuppoſe him to be a perſon well known. Nothing ſuppoſes greater notoriety than to call a perſon ſimply Mr. It is therefore, great preſumption, or affectation, in a writer, to prefix his name in this manner to any performance, as if all the world were well acquainted with his name and merit.

In general, it may be ſufficient to prefix the article to the former of two words in the ſame conſtruction; tho' the French never fail to repeat it in this caſe. *There were many hours, both of* the *night and day, which he could ſpend, without ſuſpicion, in ſolitary thought.* Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 23 It might have been, *of* the *night, and of* the *day.* And, for the ſake of emphaſis, we often repeat the article in a ſeries of epithets. *He hoped that this title would ſecure him* a *perpetual, and* an *independent authority.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 326.

We ſometimes, after the manner of the French, repeat the ſame article when the adjective, on account of any clauſe depending upon it, is put after the ſubſtantive. *Of all the conſiderable governments among the Alps, a commonwealth is a conſtitution,*

ſtitution, the *moſt adapted of any to the poverty of thoſe countries*. Addiſon on Medals. *With ſuch a ſpecious title, as that of blood, which with the multitude is always the claim*, the *ſtrongeſt, and moſt eaſily comprehended*. Ib. p. 235. *They are not the men in the nation*, the *moſt difficult to be replaced*. Devil upon Crutches.

We ſometimes repeat the Article, when the epithet precedes the ſubſtantive. *He was met by* the *worſhipful* the *magiſtrates*.

It ſhould ſeem, that as *a* without *n* is prefixed to a conſonant, it ought to ſuffice before an *h* that is ſounded, which is, generally, equivalent to a conſonant; yet many writers prefix *an* to words beginning with that letter. *An half*. Blackſtone's Commentaries. *Beings of* an *higher order*. Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 112.

A is ſometimes put for *every*; as in ſuch phraſes as theſe, *a hundred*, a *year*, i. e. *every year*; or for *one*, as when we ſay, *ſo much* a *dozen*, a *pound*, &c. *A hundred men* a *day died of it*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5 p. 80. The French always uſe the article *the* in this conſtruction. It appears, however, that the article *a*, which, in many caſes, ſignifies *one*, ſhould not be prefixed to words which expreſs a great number, yet cuſtom authoriſes this uſe of it.

it. *Liable to* a great many *inconveniencies*. Tillotſon. *Many a man*, i. e. *many times a man*.

A nice diſtinction of the ſenſe is ſometimes made by the uſe or omiſſion of the article *a*. If I ſay, *he behaved with a little reverence*, my meaning is poſitive. If I ſay, *He behaved with little reverence*, my meaning is negative; and theſe two are by no means the ſame, or to be uſed in the ſame caſes. By the former I rather praiſe a perſon, by the latter I diſpraiſe him.

For the ſakeof this diſtinction, which is a very uſeful one, we may better bear the ſeeming impropriety of this article *a* before nouns of number. When I ſay *there were* few men *with him*, I ſpeak diminutively, and mean to repreſent them as inconſiderable. Whereas, when I ſay *There were* a few men *with him*, I evidently intend to make the moſt of them.

Sometimes a nice diſtinction may be made in the ſenſe by a regard to the poſition of the article only. When we ſay, *half a crown*, we mean a piece of money of one half of the value of a crown; but when we ſay *a half crown* we mean a half crown piece, or a piece of metal,

of

of a certain ſize, figure, &c. Two ſhillings and ſix pence is *half a crown*, but not *a half crown*.

The article *the* is often elegantly put, after the manner of the French, for the pronoun poſſeſſive. As, *he looks him full in* the *face*, i. e. *in his face*. *That awful Majeſty, in whoſe preſence they were to ſtrike* the *forehead on the ground*, i. e. *their foreheads*. Ferguſon on Civil Society, p. 390.

Some writers, according to the ſame idiom, drop the article *the* before titles, and write (for they would not ſay) *preface, introduction, dedication*, &c. inſtead of, *the preface, the introduction, the dedication*, &c. which is the true Engliſh idiom.

In applying the ordinal numbers to a ſeries of kings, &c. we generally interpoſe the article *the* between the name and the adjective expreſſing the number, as, *Henry* the *firſt*, *Charles* the *ſecond*; but ſome writers affect to tranſpoſe theſe words, and place the numeral adjective firſt. *The firſt Henry*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 497. This conſtruction is common with this writer, but there ſeems to be a familiarity and want of dignity in it.

The

The article *the* has, ſometimes, a fine effect, in diſtinguiſhing a perſon by an epithet; as it gives us an idea of him, as being the only perſon to whom it can be applied. *In the Hiſtory of Henry the fourth, by father Daniel, we are ſurprized at not finding him* the *great man.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 5. p. 82. *I own, I am often ſurprized you ſhould have treated ſo coldly, a man, ſo much* the *gentleman.* Fair American, vol. 1. p. 13. Sometimes this ſame article is uſed in converſation, with a peculiar kind of emphaſis, ſimilar to the caſes above-mentioned; as, *He was never* the *man, that gave me a penny in his whole life.*

When a word is in ſuch a ſtate, as that it may, with very little impropriety, be conſidered, either as a proper, or a common name, the article *the* may be prefixed to it or not, at pleaſure. *The Lord Darnly was the perſon in whom moſt men's wiſhes centered.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 87. *Lord Darnly* would have read juſt as well; and this form is more common, the word *Lord* being generally conſidered as part of the proper name.

Formerly, the article *the* was prefixed to the pronoun relative. *In the which.* Corinthians.

For the greater emphaſis, degrees of compariſon frequently take this article. The oftener *I read this author*, the more *I admire him. I think his ſtyle* the beſt I *ever read.*

In a variety of phraſes, in which the ſenſe is abſtract, or the ſentence contracted, articles are omitted. As *he went on foot, or on horſeback* In many of theſe caſes, it is not improbable, but that the articles were uſed originally; but were dropped when the phraſes became familiar. Thus *ſea, by land, on ſhore*, &c. might have been, *by the ſea, by the land, on the ſhore*, &c. When ſuch phraſes as theſe are very familiar, we do not expect an article, and are rather diſappointed when we find one. *The half learned man, relying upon his ſtrength, ſeldom peeceives his wants, till he finds his deception paſt* a cure. Hiſtory of England in Letters, vol. 1. p. 41. We generally ſay, *paſt cure.* When words are uſed, in this manner, without any article, it is a pretty ſure ſign, that they are, or have been, in frequent uſe. *The rights and immunities* of holy church. Parliamentary Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 12.

When the names of things are ſo circumſtanced, that articles, and other marks of particularity, are unneceſſary; we uſually

ally omit them, eſpecially in converſation. A familiar example of this we may obſerve in perſons ſpeaking to children, who generally ſay, *nurſe*, *pappa*, or *mamma*; and ſeldom *your nurſe*, *your pappa*, or *your mamma*; becauſe the child has no idea of any nurſe, &c. beſides his own.

In many other caſes, the articles ſeem to be omitted where we can diſcover nothing but a mere ellipſis; as no reaſon can be ſeen for the omiſſion, except that it has a little more conciſeneſs or energy. Thus we ſay, *Have you* trout *in this river*, i. e. *have you any of that ſpecies of fiſh which is called trout. Nothing is ſo dangerous, as to unite two perſons ſo cloſely, in all their intereſts and concerns, as* man and wife, *without rendering the union entire and total.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 259. *He was fired with the deſire of doing ſomething, tho' he knew not yet, with diſtinctneſs, either* end or means. Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 22. In the former of theſe ſentences, the words *a man and his wife* would have conveyed the ſame idea, and in the ſame extent, as *man and wife*; for the meaning of both is preciſely, *any man and his wife.* In the latter ſentence, *the end and the means* would have expreſſed the idea very completely,

ſince

ſince only one particular end or means was intended.

In the following ſentence an univerſality ſeems to be aimed at by the omiſſion of the article, which the ſenſe hardly requires. *The pope found himſelf entitled to the poſſeſſion of England and Ireland, on account of the hereſy of* prince and people. *Of the prince* would have been better. In ſome caſes, however, there ſeems to be a peculiar elegance in adopting the univerſal ſenſe of the word, by omitting the article when it might have been uſed with propriety enough. *If the young man who appeared in Flanders was really* ſon *to king Edward, he never would bear arms againſt him.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 383. Perhaps the following ſentence is rather more elegant by the omiſſion of the article. *I ſuſpect, that from any height where life can be ſupported, there may be danger of* too quick deſcent. Raſſelas, vol. 1. p. 39. *Too quick* a *deſcent* is more common.

In many caſes, articles are omitted in common converſation, or in familiar ſtyle, which ſeems to have a propriety in writing, or in grave ſtyle. At worſt, *time might be gained by this expedient.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 435. *At the worſt* might have

have been better in this place. In very familiar ſtyle we ſometimes drop the article after it has been frequently uſed. *Give me here John Baptiſt's head.* There would have been more dignity in ſaying, *John the Baptiſt's head.*

SECTION IX.

Of the Uſe of Prepoſitions.

ALL that I have done in this difficult part of grammar, concerning the proper uſe of prepoſitions, has been to make a few general remarks upon the ſubject; and then to give a collection of the inſtances, that have occurred to me, of the improper uſe of ſome of them. To make a grammar complete, every verb, and adjective, to which theſe prepoſitions are ever ſubjoined, ought to be reduced into tables; in which all the variety of caſes in which they are uſed, ſhould be carefully diſtinguiſhed. The greateſt part of ſuch tables, however, would be of little uſe to Engliſh men, who are generally accuſtomed to the right prepoſition;

and who will be chiefly liable to make miſtakes where others have been miſtaken before them; and a conſiderable number of theſe caſes I have noted.

Different relations, and different ſenſes, muſt be expreſſed by different prepoſitions; tho' in conjunction with the ſame verb or adjective. Thus we ſay, *to converſe* with *a perſon*, upon *a ſubject*, in *a houſe*, &c. We alſo ſay, *we are diſappointed* of *a thing*, when we cannot get it; and *diſappointed* in *it*, when we have it, and find it does not anſwer our expectations. But two different prepoſitions muſt be improper in the ſame conſtruction, and in the ſame ſentence. *The combat* between *thirty Britons*, againſt *twenty Engliſh*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 2. p. 292.

In ſome caſes, it is not poſſible to ſay to which of two prepoſitions the preference is to be given, as both are uſed promiſcuouſly, and cuſtom has not decided in favour of either of them. We ſay, *expert* at, and *expert* in *a thing*. *Expert at finding a remedy for his miſtakes*. Hume's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 417. We ſay, *diſapproved* of, and *diſapproved* by *a perſon*. *Diſapproved* by *our court*. Swift. It is not improbable, but that, in time, theſe different conſtructions may be appropriated to different

ferent uſes. All languages furniſh examples of this kind, and the Engliſh as many as any other.

When prepoſitions are ſubjoined to nouns, they are generally the ſame which are ſubjoined to the verbs, from which the nouns are derived. *John, ſhewing the ſame diſpoſition to tyranny* over *his ſubjects.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 1. p. 74. i. e. *to tyrannize* over *his ſubjects.*

When a word ending in *ing* is preceded by an article, it ſeems to be uſed as a noun; and therefore ought not to govern another word, without the intervention of a prepoſition. *By blackening his fame, had that injury been in their power, they formed a very proper prelude to* the murdering *his perſon.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 117. In this conſtruction, the word *murdering* is evidently a participle of an active verb. Qu. alſo, is *murdering a man's perſon* proper?

The force of a prepoſition is implied in ſome words, particularly in the word *home.* When we ſay, *he went home*; we mean to *his own houſe*; yet in other conſtructions, this ſame word requires a prepoſition; for we ſay, *he went* from home.

Many writers affect to ſubjoin to any word the prepoſition with which it is com-

pounded, or the idea of which it implies; in order to point out the relation of the words in a more diſtinct and definite manner, and to avoid the more indeterminate prepoſitions *of*, and *to*; but general practice, and the idiom of the Engliſh tongue, ſeems to oppoſe the innovation. Thus many writers ſay *averſe* from *a thing*. *Averſe* from *Venus*. Pope. *The abhorrence* againſt *all other ſects*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 34. But other writers uſe *averſe* to *it*, which ſeems more truly Engliſh. *Averſe* to *any advice*. Swift. An attention to the latent metaphor may be pleaded in favour of the former example, and this is a rule of general uſe, in directing what prepoſitions to ſubjoin to a word. Thus we ſay *devolve* upon *a thing*, and Mr. Addiſon improperly ſays, *poetical imitation*, founded in [on] *natural reſemblance, is much inferior to that of painting*. But this rule would ſometimes miſlead us, particularly where the figure has become nearly evaneſcent. Thus we ſhould naturally expect, that the word *depend* would require *from* after it; but cuſtom obliges us to ſay *depend upon*, as well as *inſiſt upon a thing*. Yet were we to uſe the ſame word where the figure was manifeſt, we ſhould uſe the

prepoſition *from*; as *the cage* depends from *the roof of the building*.

Of the Prepoſition of.

Several of our modern writers have leaned to the French idiom in the uſe of the prepoſition *of*, by applying it where the French uſe *de*, tho' the Engliſh idiom would require another prepoſition, or no prepoſition at all in the caſe; but no writer has departed more from the genius of the Engliſh tongue, in this reſpect, than Mr. Hume. *Richlieu profited* of *every circumſtance, which the conjuncture afforded.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 251. We ſay *profited* by. *He remembered him* of *the fable.* Ib. vol. 5. p. 181. The *great difficulty they find* of *fixing juſt ſentiments.* Ib. *The king of England, provided* of *every ſupply.* Ib. vol. 1. p. 206. In another place he writes, *provide them* in *food and raiment.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 65. The true Engliſh idiom ſeems to be *to provide* with *a thing*. *It is ſituation chiefly which* decides of *the fortunes and character of men.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 283. i. e. *concerning*. *He found the greateſt difficulty* of *writing*. Ib. vol. 1. p. 401. i. e. in. Of *which, he was extremely greedy, extremely prodigal, and ex-*

tremely neceſſitous. Ib. vol. 4. p. 12. *He was* eager of *recommending it to his fellow-citizens*. Ib. vol. 7. p. 161. *The good lady was careful of* ſerving me of *every thing*. In this example *with* would have been more proper.

It is agreeable to the ſame idiom, that *of* ſeems to be uſed inſtead of *for* in the following ſentences. *The rain hath been falling* of *a long time*. Maupertuis' Voyage, p. 60. *It might perhaps have given me a greater taſte* of *its antiquities*. Addiſon. *Of*, in this place, occaſions a real ambiguity in the ſenſe. *A taſte* of a *thing* implies actual enjoyment of it; but *a taſte* for *it* only implies a capacity for enjoyment. *The eſteem which Philip had conceived* of *the ambaſſador*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 90. *You know the eſteem I have* of *this philoſophy*. Law Tracts, vol. 1. p. 3. *Youth wandering in foreign countries, with as little reſpect* of *others, as prudence of his own, to guard him from danger. An indemnity* of *paſt offences*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 29.

In the following ſentences, *on* or *upon* might very well be ſubſtituted for *of*. *Was totally dependent* of *the papal crown*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 71. *Laid hold* of Ib. vol. 1. p. 292. We alſo

uſe

uſe *of* inſtead of *on* or *upon*, in the following familiar phraſes, which occur chiefly in converſation; *to call* of *a perſon*, and *to wait* of *him*.

In ſome caſes, a regard to the French idiom hath taught us to ſubſtitute *of* for *in*. *The great difficulty they found* of *fixing juſt ſentiments*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 63. *Curious* of *Antiquities*. Dryden.

In a variety of caſes, the prepoſition *of* ſeems to be ſuperfluous in our language; and in moſt of them, it has been derived to us from the French. *Notwithſtanding* of *the numerous panegyrics on the ancient Engliſh liberty*. Hume's Eſſays, p. 81. *Notwithſtanding* of *this unlucky example*. Ib. p. 78. Aukward as this conſtruction is, it is generally uſed by ſeveral of our later writers. This prepoſition ſeems to be ſuperfluous, when it is prefixed to a word which is only uſed to ſhew the extent of another preceding word, as, *the city of London, the paſſions of hope and fear are very ſtrong*. It alſo ſeems to be ſuperfluous after ſeveral adjectives, which are ſometimes uſed as ſubſtantives, *a dozen of years*. Hume's Eſſays, p. 258.

In the following inſtances, it may be a matter of indifference whether we uſe this prepoſition or not. *To one who conſiders*

coolly of *the ſubject*. Hume's Political Eſſays, p. 141. *I can conceive of nothing more worthy of him.* Price. It is ſometimes omitted, and ſometimes inſerted after *worthy*. *It is worthy obſervation.* Hume's Hiſtory. I ſhould chuſe to make uſe of it in this caſe. But I think it had better be omitted in the following ſentence. *The emulation who ſhould ſerve their country beſt no longer ſubſiſts among them, but* of *who ſhould obtain the moſt lucrative command.* Montague's Riſe and Fall of ancient Republicks, p. 137. The whole conſtruction of this ſentence is by no means natural. The meaning of it, when expreſſed at full length is, *The emulation which conſiſts in ſtriving who ſhould ſerve his country*, &c.

The prepoſition *of* ſeems to be omitted in the following ſentence, in which it reſembles the French idiom. *All this, however, is eaſily learned from medals, where they may ſee likewiſe the plan of many, the moſt conſiderable buildings of ancient Rome.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 23. i. e. *of many* of *the moſt conſiderable buildings*, &c.

Of is frequently ambiguous, and would oftener be perceived to be ſo, did not the ſenſe of the reſt of the paſſage in which it occurs prevent that inconvenience; and this it will often do, even when this part

of

of the ſentence, ſingly taken, would ſuggeſt a meaning the very reverſe of what is intended. *The attack* of *the Engliſh* naturally means *an attack made by the Engliſh, upon others*; but, in the following ſentence, it means an attack made upon the Engliſh. *The two princes concerted the means of rendering ineffectual their common attack* of *the Engliſh.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 114. *The oppreſſion of the peaſants ſeemeth great*, p. 152. is in itſelf quite ambiguous, but the ſenſe of the paſſage makes the peaſants to be the oppreſſed, not the oppreſſors.

Of is uſed in a particular ſenſe in the phraſe, *he is* of *age*, the meaning of which is, *he is arrived at what is deemed the age of manhood.*

Of the Prepoſitions to *and* for.

Agreeably to the Latin and French idioms, the prepoſition *to* is ſometimes uſed in conjunction with ſuch words as, in thoſe languages, govern the dative caſe; but this conſtruction does not ſeem to ſuit the Engliſh language. *His ſervants ye are, to whom ye obey.* Romans. *And to their general's voice they ſoon obeyed.* Milton. *The people of England may congratulate* to *them-*

themſelves, that the nature of our govern ment, and the clemency of our kings ſecure us. Dryden. *Something like this has been reproached* to *Tacitus.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 136.

To ſeems to be uſed inſtead of *for* in the following ſentences. *Deciding law ſuits* to *the northern counties.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 191 *A great change* to *the better.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 133. At leaſt *for* is more uſual in this conſtruction.

To ſeems to be uſed improperly in the following ſentences. *His abhorrence* to *that ſuperſtitious figure.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 383. i. e, *of. Thy prejudice* to *my cauſe.* Dryden. i. e. *againſt. Conſequent* to. Locke. i. e. *upon. The Engliſh were very different people then* to *what they are at preſent.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 1. p. 178.

In compliance to *the declaration of the Engliſh parliament.* Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 57.

In ſeveral caſes, *to* may be ſuppreſſed; but if there be two clauſes of a ſentence, in the ſame conſtruction, it ſhould either be omitted, or inſerted in both alike *The people ſtole his gibbet, and paid it the ſame veneration, as* to *his croſs.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 2. p. 39.

The

The place of the prepoſition *for*, might have been better ſupplied by other prepoſitions in the following ſentences. *The worſhip of this deity is extremely ridiculous, and therefore better* adapted for *the vulgar*. Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 1. p. 203. i. e. *to*. *To die* for *thirſt*. Addiſon. i. e. *of* or *by*. *More than they* thought for [of]. D'Alembert's Hiſtory of the Expulſion of the Jeſuits, p. 132. *I think that virtue is ſo amiable in herſelf, that there is no need* for [of] *the knowledge of God, to make her beloved and followed* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 1. p. 30. *If the party chuſe to* inſiſt for [upon] *it*. Law Tracts, vol. 1. p. 70.

The prepoſition *for*, is uſed in a peculiar ſenſe in the following paſſage; *and* prejudices for prejudices, *ſome perſons may be apt to think, that thoſe of a churchman are as tolerable as of any other*. Law Tracts, vol. 1. p. 184. i. e. *if prejudices on all ſides be fairly compared*.

For is ſuperfluous in the phraſe, *more than he knows for*. Shakeſpear. This is only uſed in familiar and colloquial ſtyle.

Of the Prepoſitions with *and* upon.

The prepoſition *with* ſeems to be uſed where *to* would have been more proper in the

the following ſentences. *Reconciling himſelf* with *the king.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 176. *Thoſe things which have the greateſt* reſemblance with *each other frequently differ the moſt.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 3. p. 65. *And that ſuch ſelection, and rejection ſhould be* conſonant with *our proper nature.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 205. *Conformable with.* Addiſon. *The hiſtory of St. Peter is* agreeable with *the ſacred text.* Newbery's New Teſtament.

Other prepoſitions had better have been ſubſtituted for *with*, in the following ſentences. *Glad* with [*at*] *the ſight of hoſtile blood.* Dryden. *He has as much reaſon to be angry* with *you as* with *him.* Preceptor, vol. 1. p. 10. *Converſant* with *a ſcience.* Pope. *In* would have been at leaſt equally proper. *They could be prevailed* with [*upon*] *to retire.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 10.

In the following ſentence *to diſperſe* with *myſelf* is uſed in the ſame ſenſe as *to excuſe myſelf. I could not diſpenſe with myſelf from making a voyage to Caprea.* Addiſon.

The prepoſition *with* and a perſonal pronoun ſometimes ſerve for a contraction of a clauſe of a ſentence. *The homunculus is endowed with the ſame locomotive powers and faculties* with *us.* Triſtram Shandy, vol.

vol. 1. p. 5. i. e. *the ſame faculties with which we are endowed.*

The oblique caſe of the perſonal pronouns is uſed in conjunction with this prepoſition by way of emphaſis, without any other addition to the ſenſe, as *away* with *thee*, *get thee gone* with *thee*.

The prepoſition *on* or *upon* ſeems to be uſed improperly in the following ſentences. *I thank you for helping me to an uſe* (of a medal) *that perhaps I ſhould not have* thought on [of]. Addiſon on Medals. *Authors have to* brag on [of]. Pope. *Cenſoricus* upon *all his brethren.* Swift. perhaps *of*. *His reaſon could not attain a thorough conviction* on *thoſe ſubjects*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 255. *A greater quantity may be taken from the heap, without making any ſenſible alteration* upon it. Hume's Political Eſſays, p. 12. i. e, in. *Every office of command ſhould be entruſted to perſons* on [in] *whom the parliament could confide.* Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 112.

This prepoſition ſeems to be ſuperfluous in the following ſentence. *Their efforts ſeemed to anticipate* on *the ſpirit, which became ſo general afterwards.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 3. p. 5.

We ſay, *to* depend upon *a thing*, but not *to* promiſe upon *it*. *But this effect we may ſafely*

ſafely ſay, no one could beforehand have promiſed upon. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 79. It might have been, *have promiſed themſelves.*

Of the Prepoſitions in, from, *and others.*

The prepoſition *in* is ſometimes uſed where the French uſe their *en*, but where ſome other prepoſitions would be more agreeable to the Engliſh idiom. Some of the following ſentences are examples of this. *He made a point of honour* in [*of*] *not departing from his enterprize.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 402. *I think it neceſſary, for the intereſt of virtue and religion, that the whole kingdom ſhould be informed* in *ſome parts of your character.* Swift. i. e. *about* or *concerning.* In ſome of theſe caſes, *in* might with advantage be changed for *to* or *into. Painters have not a little contributed to bring the ſtudy of medals* in *vogue.* Addiſon. On the other hand, I have found *into* put for *in: engaged him* into *attempts.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 162. *To be liable* in *a compenſation.* Law Tracts, vol. 1. p. 45.

It is agreeable to the French idiom, that *in* is ſometimes put for *with, He had been*

been provided in *a ſmall living by the Duke of Norfolk.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 68.

In ſome familiar caſes, there is an ellipſis of this prepoſition. *It was eſteemed* no wiſe *probable.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 315. but this conſtruction hardly ſuits grave ſtyle.

In is ſuperfluous in the colloquial phraſe, *he finds me* in *money and cloaths*, &c.

The prepoſition *from* had better be changed in the following ſentences. *The eſtates of all were burthened by fines and confiſcations, which had been levied* from *them.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 315. *He acquits me* from *mine iniquity.* Job. better *of. Could he have profited* from [*by*] *repeated experiences.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 259.

From ſeems to be ſuperfluous after *forbear. He could not forbear* from *appointing the Pope to be one of the Godfathers.* Ib. vol. 8. p. 282.

The prepoſition *among* always implies a number of things; and, therefore, cannot be uſed in conjunction with the word *every*, which is in the ſingular number. *Which is found* among every *ſpecies of liberty.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 92. *The opinion of the advance of riches in the iſland*

ſeems

ſeems to gain ground among every body. Hume's political Eſſays, p. 71.

There ſeems to be ſome impropriety in the uſe of the prepoſition *under* in the following ſentence. *That range of hills, known* under *the general name of mount Jura.* Account of Geneva.

The prepoſition *through* is ſometimes ſupplied by a very particular conſtruction of the adjective *long*, thus *all night long*, and *all day long*, are equivalent to, *through all the night, through all the day.*

Sometimes *a* is put for *in*. *But the Baſſa detains us till he receives orders from Adrianople, which may probably be* a month a coming. Lady Montague's Letters, vol. 1. p. 147. i. e. *in coming.*

SECTION X.

Of the Order of Words in a Sentence.

AN adjective ſhould not be ſeparated from its ſubſtantive, even by words which modify its meaning, and make but one ſenſe with it. *A* large enough number

ber *ſurely*. Hume's Political Eſſays, p. 196. *a number large anough. The lower ſort of people are* good enough judges *of one not very diſtant from them.* Ib. p. 261. *Ten thouſand is* a large enough baſe. Ib.

Adjectives ſignifying dimenſions, and ſome other properties of things, come after the nouns expreſſing thoſe particular dimenſions, or properties. *A tree three feet thick. A body fifty thouſand ſtrong.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 242. This laſt expreſſion is rather vulgar.

There is, ſometimes, great elegance, as well as force, in placing the adjective before the verb, and the ſubſtantive immediately after it; as, Great *is the* Lord, juſt *and* true *are thy* ways, *thou king of ſaints*. It gives a poetical elevation to the expreſſion.

Sometimes the word *all* is emphatically put after a number of particulars comprehended under it.

Her fury, her deſpair, her every geſture
Was nature's language all.

Voltaire, vol. 27. p. 274.

Ambition, intereſt, glory, all *concurred.* Letters on Chivalry, p. 11. Sometimes a ſubſtantive, which likewiſe, comprehends the preceding particulars, is uſed

in

in conjunction with this adjective. *Royaliſts, republicans, churchmen, ſectaries, courtiers, patriots*; all parties *concurred in the illuſion.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 73.

The word *ſuch* is often placed after a number of particulars to which it equally relates. *The figures of diſcourſe, the pointed antitheſis, the unnatural conceit, the jingle of words*; ſuch *falſe ornaments were not employed by early writers.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 129.

By way of emphaſis, the demonſtrative pronoun *this*, though in the conſtruction of a nominative caſe, is ſometimes placed without any verb, after the words to which it belongs. *A matter of great importance* this, *in the conduct of life.* I cannot ſay that I admire this conſtruction, though it be much uſed, and particularly, if I remember right, by Mr. Seed, in his ſermons.

Words deſigned to diſtinguiſh, and to give an emphaſis to the perſonal pronouns, which are the nominative caſe to a verb, are naturally placed after it. *If ye forgive not, every one of you, his brother his treſpaſſes.*

When a ſentence begins with the words *all, many, ſo, as, how, too*, and perhaps ſome

ſome others, the article *a* is elegantly preceded by the adjective, and followed by its correſpondent ſubſtantive. *He ſpake in ſo affectionate* a *manner.* So *tall* a *man I never ſaw before.* So *profeſſed* an *admirer of the antient poets.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 27. *He is too great* a *man.*

Moſt other particles muſt be placed before the adjectives; as, *he ſpake in* quite an *affectionate manner.* Such a *dark cloud overcaſt the evening of that day.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 469. So *dark* a *cloud* would have been equivalent, and in all reſpects better. *He was no leſs able a negociator, than a courageous warrior.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 1. p. 181.

The prepoſition *of* will not bear to be ſeparated from the noun which it either precedes or follows, without a diſagreeable effect. *The ignorance of that age, in mechanical arts, rendered* the progreſs *very ſlow* of *this new invention.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 445. *Being in no ſenſe capable* of *either* intention *or remiſſion.* Harris's three Treatiſes p. 190. *The* word *itſelf* of *God. His* picture, *in diſtemper*, of *calumny borrowed from the deſcription of one painted by Apelles, was ſuppoſed to be a ſatyr on that cardinal.* Walpole's Anecdotes.

The

The country firſt dawned, that illuminated the world, and beyond which the arts *cannot be traced,* of *civil ſociety or domeſtic life.* Raſſelas, vol. 2. p. 32.

Little explanatory circumſtances are particularly aukward between a genitive caſe, and the word which uſually follows it. *She began to extol the* farmer's, *as ſhe called him,* excellent underſtanding. Harriot Watſon, vol. 1. p. 27.

If an entire clauſe of a ſentence depend upon a word followed by *of*, the tranſpoſition is eaſy. *Few* examples *occur,* of *princes who have willingly reſigned their power,* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 472. If the words followed by this particle make a clauſe, which might have been omitted, and have left the ſenſe compleat, it may be inſerted at ſome diſtance from the noun on which they depend, as it were, by way of parentheſis. *The nobleſt* diſcoveries *thoſe authors ever made,* of *art or of nature, have all been produced by the tranſcendent genius of the preſent age.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 57.

The prepoſition *of*, and the words with which it is connected, may often elegantly precede the verb on which they both depend. *Two months had now paſſed, and of Pekuah nothing had been heard.* Raſ-

Raſſelas, vol. 2. p. 54. This conſtruction is not quite ſo eaſy, when theſe words depend upon a ſubſtantive coming after them. *He found the place replete with wonders*, of which *he propoſed to ſolace himſelf with* the contemplation, *if he would never be able to accompliſh his flight.* Ib. vol. 1. p. 32. This conſtruction is properly French, and does not ſucceed very well in Engliſh. Of the preſent ſtate, *whatever it be, we feel and are forced to confeſs* the miſery. Ib. p. 143. In the former of theſe ſentences we ſhould read, *with the contemplation of which he propoſed to ſolace himſelf. I am glad, then, ſays Cynthio, that he has thrown him upon a ſcience*, of which *he has long wiſhed to hear* the uſefulneſs. Addiſon on Medals, p. 12.

It is a matter of indifference, with reſpect to the pronoun *one another*, whether the prepoſition *of* be placed between the two parts of it, or before them both. We may either ſay, *they were jealous* one of another, or *they were jealous* of one another.

Whenever no ambiguity will be occaſioned by putting the nominative caſe after the verb, this conſtruction makes an elegant variety in Engliſh ſtyle. This is particularly the caſe in verbs neuter, which admit of no object of the affirmation.

Upon

Upon thy right hand ſtands *the* Queen. The nominative caſe has always this place when a ſentenſe begins with the particle *there*. There was a man *ſent from God, whoſe name was John*. And generally after *then*. Then came *unto him the* Phariſees. It may often, in other caſes, have this place, and even be ſeparated from the verb by other words. *His character is as much diſputed as* is *commonly* that *of princes who are our cotemporaries*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 97. But they are aukwardly ſeparated in the following ſentence. *Even* the ſavage, *ſtill leſs than the citizen*, can *be made to quit that manner of life, in which he has been trained*. Ferguſon on Civil Society, p. 145.

In the cloſe of a paragraph, the nominative caſe generally follows the verb, even when the ſentence is affirmative. *And thus* have you *exhibited a ſort of a ſketch of art*. Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 12.

But when the nominative caſe is complex, and conſiſts of ſeveral words, it is better to place it before the verb. The following ſentence, in which a different order is obſerved, is ungraceful. *An undertaking, which in the execution, proved as impracticable*, as had *turned out* every other of their pernicious, yet abortive ſchemes.

ſchemes. Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 256.

The nominative caſe does not eaſily follow the verb when the particle *than* precedes it. *He thought that the preſbyters would ſoon have become more dangerous to the magiſtrate, than* had *ever been* the prelatical clergy. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 71. *than the prelatical clergy had ever been.*

When the nominative caſe is put after a verb, the adverb *never*, and ſuch others as are uſually placed after the verb, are put before them both; and when thoſe words begin a ſentence, we are diſappointed, if the verb do not immediately follow it. Never *ſovereign* was *bleſſed with more moderation of temper.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 389. *never was ſovereign. Hence the* impoſſibility appears, *that this undertaking ſhould be begun and carried on in a monarchy.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 173. *hence appears the impoſſibility.*

Alſo when the nominative caſe is put after the verb, on account of an interrogation, no other word ſhould be interpoſed between them. May not we *here ſay with Lucretius.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 29. may we not *ſay.* Is not *it I he.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 18. p. 152. *is it not he.*

When

When a nominative caſe is not put after a verb, it has a ſtill worſe effect to place the negative particles before it. Not only he found *himſelf a priſoner very narrowly guarded.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 77. It ſhould either have been, he not only found *himſelf*, or *not only did he find himſelf.* The following ſentence is ſtill more aukwardly conſtructed, by the interpoſition of a clauſe between the nominative caſe and the verb. Not only *the power of the crown, by means of wardſhips and purveyance*, was *very conſiderable, it was alſo unequal, and perſonal.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 362.

The auxiliary verb *do*, or *did*, is neceſſarily placed before the nominative caſe, when the ſentence begins with *neither*, *nor*, and perhaps ſome other adverbs. This rule is obſerved in one part of the following ſentence, and neglected in the other. The difference of the effect will be perceived by every Engliſh ear. *Neither the conſtable opened his gates to them, nor did the Duke of Burgundy bring him the ſmalleſt aſſiſtance.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 266.

By a very peculiar idiom, the nominative caſe is ſometimes put after the verbs *may*, *can*, *&c.* when ſurprize is expreſſed,

or a queſtion is reported, &c. the words *if*, *whether*, &c. being underſtood, as, *I wonder*, can he do *it*; i. e. *I wonder whether he can do it. She demanded of me*, could I play *at cribbage*. Swift's Poſthumous Works. i. e. *She demanded of me, if I could play*. I have frequently heard this form of expreſſion in converſation, but do not remember ever to have met with it in writing, except in this paſſage of Swift.

The negative particles are not well ſituated between the active participles of auxiliary verbs, and the paſſive participles of other verbs. *Which* being not *admitted into general uſe* does not pleaſe the ear ſo well as *which* not being *admitted*. Having not *known, or not conſidered*; i. e. not having *known*.

When ſeveral auxiliary verbs are uſed, the place of the adverb is after the firſt of them (if the ſecond of them be not a participle) whether the nominative caſe come before or after the verb. *The three graces are always hand in hand, to ſhow us that theſe three ſhould* be never *ſeparated*. Addiſon on Medals, p. 29 *ſhould* never be *ſeparated*. *And ſince the favour can be conferred but upon few, the greater number* will be always *diſcontented*. Raſſelas, vol. 2. p. 9. *will always be*. Shall I be never

ſuffered to forget theſe lectures. Ib. vol. 1. p. 16. *ſhall I never be.*

Though the negative participles follow the auxiliary verbs in an interrogation, no other adverbs ſhould be placed there along with them. *Would* not then *this art have been wholly unknown.* Harris's three Treatiſes, p. 24. *Would not this art then have been.*

So cloſely do we expect every relative to follow its antecedent, that if the antecedent be a negative caſe, the other ſubſtantive cannot be interpoſed between them, without a diſagreeable effect. *They attacked* Northumberland's *houſe*, whom *they put to death.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 3. p. 362. *He had ſufficient experience of the extreme ardour and impatience of* Henry's *temper*, who *could bear no contradiction.* Ib. vol. 4. p. 99. *I ſhall not confine myſelf to any* man's *rules* that *ever lived.* Triſtram Shandy, vol. 1. p. 10.

In the following ſentences the relative, being ſtill farther removed from its antecedent, has a ſtill worſe effect. *To involve* his miniſter, *in ruin*, who *had been the author of it.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 225. Primauzeth's *ſhip was ſet on fire*, who, *finding his deſtruction inevitable, bore down upon the Engliſh admiral.* Ib. vol. 3. p. 362.

The

The object of an affirmation ſhould not eaſily be ſeparated from its verb by the intervention of other clauſes of the ſentence. The bad effect of this arrangement may be perceived in the following examples. *Frederick, ſeeing it was impoſſible to* truſt, *with ſafety*, his life *in the hands of Chriſtians, was obliged to take the Mahometans for his guard.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 2. p. 73. *The emperor refuſed* to convert, *at once*, the truce *into a definitive treaty.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 310. *Becket could not better* diſcover, *than by attacking ſo powerful an intereſt*, his reſolution *to maintain with vigour the rights, real or pretended, of his church.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 415.

Even when a verb and a prepoſition, or ſome other word, make as it were, but one compound word, and have but one joint meaning, yet they ſhould be ſeparated in this caſe. *Arran propoſed to* invite *back* the king *upon conditions.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 299. *to invite the king back.*

The French always place their adverbs immediately after their verbs, but this order by no means ſuits the idiom of the Engliſh tongue, yet Mr. Hume has uſed it in his hiſtory, almoſt without variation.

His government gave courage to the Engliſh barons to carry farther *their oppoſition.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 46. *Edward obtained a diſpenſation from his oath, which the barons had compelled Gaveſton to take, that he would* adjure for ever *the realm.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 342. *to carry their oppoſition farther*, and, *to abjure the realm for ever.*

Sometimes a clauſe of a ſentence, containing a ſeparate circumſtance, is put in the place of the adverb. *However the miſerable remains* were, *in the night*, taken *down.* Univerſal Hiſt. vol. 24. p. 272.

When there are more auxiliaries than one, the adverb ſhould be placed after them, immediately before the participle. *Diſſertations on the prophecies which* have remarkably been *fulfilled in the world.* Title page to Dr. Newton's treatiſe on the prophecies. This combination appears very irregular and harſh. It ſhould have been, *which have been remarkably fulfilled.* There are, however ſome adverbs, in very common uſe, as *always*, *generally*, *often*, *&c.* which, if we judge by the ear, are better placed betwixt the auxiliaries; as, *He* has always been *reckoned an honeſt man. The book* may always *be had at ſuch a place.*

So

So convenient is the place between the auxiliary verb and the participle for other words, that ſeveral adjectives, agreeing with the nominative caſe, are beſt inſerted there. *They* all are *inveſted with the power of puniſhing.* Account of Geneva, p. 91. *they* are all *inveſted.*

Too many circumſtances are thrown before the nominative caſe and the verb, in the following ſentence. *This is what we mean by the original contract of ſociety, which, though, perhaps,* in no inſtance it has *ever been formally expreſſed, at the firſt inſtitution of a ſtate, yet, in nature, and reaſon, ſhould always be underſtood and implied in every act of aſſociating together.* Blackſtone's Commentaries, vol. 1. p. 48. The arrangement of this ſentence will be rectified by placing the circumſtance, *in no inſtance,* between the auxiliary and the participle; *which though perhaps,* it *has, in no inſtance, been formally expreſſed.*

The parts of the word *however,* are often ſeparated by the interpoſition of an adjective, and the particle *ſo* is prefixed to the part *ever*; which ſeems to be much better than to ſubjoin the adjective to the entire word. *The king,* however little *ſcrupulous in ſome reſpects, was incapable of any thing harſh or barbarous.* Hume's

Hiſt. vol. 7. p. 468. *how little ſcrupulous ſoever. The opinions of that ſect ſtill kept poſſeſſion of his mind*, however little *they appeared in his conduct.* Ib. 471. *how little ſoever.* However much *he might deſpiſe the maxims of the king's adminiſtration, he kept a total ſilence on that ſubject.* Ib. vol. 8. p. 267. *how much ſoever.*

The pronouns *whichſoever, howſoever*, and the like, are alſo elegantly divided by the interpoſition of the correſponding ſubſtantive, and make a better conſtruction than *which ever*, &c. without *ſo* preceding the ſubſtantive. *On* which ever ſide *the king caſt his eyes.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 6. p. 350. To my ear, *on which ſide ſoever* ſounds better.

The active participle, placed before its ſubſtantive, in imitation of the ablative caſe in Latin, makes a very aukward conſtruction in Engliſh. *Removing the term from Weſtminſter*, ſitting the parliament, *was illegal.* Macaulay's Hiſt. vol. 3. p. 283. *while the parliament was ſitting*, or *the parliament being ſitting.*

In familiar ſtyle, the word *though* cloſes a ſentence, as it were, elliptically. *Indeed but he did though.* Female Quixote, vol. 1. p. 132.

SECTION

SECTION XI.

Of the Correſpondence of Words expreſſing Numbers.

A Number of perſons, though conſidered in ſucceſſion, in which caſe there exiſts only one at a time, ſhould, nevertheleſs, be ſpoken of as in the plural number. *The diſſentions it had at home, with its biſhops, and the violences it ſuffered from without, particularly from its conſtant and inveterate* enemy, the Dukes *of Savoy, kept it engaged in a perpetual ſcene of war and confuſion.* Account of Geneva, p. 19. *enemies.*

It is a rule, that two diſtinct ſubjects of an affirmation require the verb to be in the plural number, in the ſame manner as if the affirmation had been made concerning two or more things of the ſame kind. But, notwithſtanding this, if the ſubjects of the affirmation be nearly related, the verb is rather better in the ſingular number. *Nothing but the* marvellous and ſupernatural hath *any charms for them.* Idleneſs and ignorance [conſidered as kind-

kindred diſpoſitions, and forming one habit of the mind] *if* it be *ſuffered to proceed*, &c. Johnſon. *He ſent his angels to fight for his people, and the* diſcomfiture and ſlaughter *of great hoſts*, is *attributed to their aſſiſtance.*

If the terms be very nearly related, a plural verb is manifeſtly harſh; though it may be thought to be ſtrictly grammatical. *His* politeneſs and obliging behaviour were *changed.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 14. *was* would have read better. *That quick march of the ſpirits, if prolonged, begets a* languor and lethargy, *that* deſtroy *all enjoyment.* Hume. *deſtroys.*

It is not neceſſary that the two ſubjects of an affirmation ſhould ſtand in the very ſame conſtruction, to require the verb to be in the plural number. If one of them be made to depend upon the other by a connecting particle, it may, in ſome caſes, have the ſame force, as if it were independence of it. *A long courſe of time*, with *a variety of accidents and circumſtances*, are *requiſite to produce thoſe revolutions.* Hume.

It is very common to conſider a collective noun as divided into the parts of which it conſiſts, and to adapt the conſtruction of the ſentence to thoſe parts,

and

and not to the whole. *If* an academy *ſhould be eſtabliſhed for the cultivation of our ſtyle, which I, who can never wiſh to ſee dependence multiplied, hope the ſpirit of Engliſh liberty will hinder, or deſtroy; let* them, *inſtead of compiling grammars and dictionaries, endeavour, with all their influence, to ſtop the license of tranſlators; whoſe idleneſs and ignorance, if it be ſuffered to proceed, will reduce us to babble a dialect of French.* Johnſon. *Let the members of it* would have been better. In this manner pronouns often miſlead perſons. Whatever *related to eccleſiaſtical meetings, matters, and perſons,* were *to be ordered according to ſuch directions as the king ſhould ſend to his privy council.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 49. *Can any* perſon, *on* their *entrance into the world, be fully ſecure, that they ſhall not be deceived.* Fair American, vol. 2. p. 26.

It is a rule reſpecting numbers, that nouns of a ſingular termination, but of a plural ſignification, may admit of a verb either ſingular or plural; but this is by no means arbitrary. We ought to conſider whether the term will immediately ſuggeſt the idea of the number it repreſents, or whether it exhibit to the mind the idea of the whole, as one thing. In

the former caſe, the verb ought to be plural, in the latter it ought to be ſingular. Thus it ſeems harſh to ſay with Harvey in Johnſon, *In France the* peaſantry goes *bare foot, and the* middle ſort, *through all that kingdom*, makes *uſe of wooden ſhoes*. It would be better to ſay, *The peaſantry go bare foot, and the middle ſort make uſe*, &c. becauſe the idea, in both theſe caſes, is that of a number. But words expreſſing the greateſt numbers may be uſed in a ſingular conſtruction, if the ideas they convey may be conceived at once; as, *a hundred pounds, a great many men*, &c.

On the contrary, there is an harſhneſs in the following ſentences of Hume, in which nouns of number have verbs plural; becauſe the ideas they repreſent ſeem not to be ſufficiently divided, as it were, in the mind. *The* court *of Rome* were *not without ſolicitude. The* houſe *of commons* were *ſo much influenced by theſe reaſons*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 108. *Stephen's* party were *entirely broke up by the captivity of their leader*. Ib. vol. 1. p. 305. *An army of twenty-four thouſand* were *aſſembled*. One would think that naming the actual number of men, of which the

the army conſiſted, would be ſufficient to break the idea into its proper parts; but I think that the effect of this ſentence upon the ear proves the contrary. An army, though conſiſting of ever ſo many men, is ſtill one thing, and the verb ought to be in the ſingular number.

Some nouns, however, of a ſingular form, but of a plural ſignification, conſtantly require a plural conſtruction; as, *the fewer or the more* acquaintance *I have*: *All the* other nobility. *They were carried over to Bohemia by* ſome youth *of their nation, who ſtudied in Oxford.* Hume's Hiſtory.

Other nouns, of a plural form, but of a ſingular ſignification, require a ſingular conſtruction; as, mathematicks is *a uſeful ſtudy.* This obſervation will likewiſe, in ſome meaſure, vindicate the grammatical propriety of the famous ſaying of William of Wykeham, Manners maketh *man.*

It is a rule, I believe, in all grammars, that when a verb comes between two nouns, either of which may be underſtood as the ſubject of the affirmation, that it may agree with either of them; but ſome regard muſt be had to that which is more naturally the ſubject of it, as alſo to that which ſtands next to the verb; for if no

regard

regard be paid to theſe circumſtances, the conſtruction will be harſh. Minced pies was *regarded as a profane and ſuperſtitious viand by the ſectaries.* Hume's Hiſtory. A great cauſe *of the low ſtate of induſtry* were *the reſtraints put upon it.* Ib. *By this term* was *underſtood*, ſuch perſons *as invented, or drew up rules for themſelves and the world.*

It ſeems wrong to join words which are attributes of unity to nouns in the plural number, as the word *whole*, in the following ſentences of Mr. Hume. *The ſeveral places of rendezvous were concerted, and the* whole operations *fixed.* Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 179. *In theſe rigid opinions the* whole ſectaries *concurred.* Ib. *Almoſt the* whole inhabitants *were preſent.* Ib. This conſtruction is, I think, uniformly obſerved by this author. Though we ſay *a whole nation*, yet there does not ſeem to be the ſame propriety in ſaying *a whole people.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 8. p. 92. becauſe the word *people* ſuggeſts the idea of a number.

It is, and *it was*, are often, after the manner of the French, uſed in a plural conſtruction, and by ſome of our beſt writers. It is *either* a few *great men who decide for the whole, or* it is the rabble *that follow*

follow a ſeditious ringleader, who is not known, perhaps, to a dozen among them. Hume's Eſſays, p. 296. It is they *that are the real authors, though the ſoldiers are the actors of the revolutions.* Lady Montague's Letters, vol. 2. p. 5. It was the hereticks *that firſt began to rail againſt the fineſt of all the arts.* Smollett's Voltaire, vol. 16. 'Tis theſe *that early taint the female ſoul.* This conſtruction ſeems almoſt unavoidable in anſwer to a queſtion aſked in the ſame form. *Who was it that caught the fiſh?* It was we. This licence in the conſtruction of *it is* (if the critical reader will think proper to admit of it at all) has however, been certainly abuſed in the following ſentence, which is thereby made a very aukward one. It is *wonderful the very few trifling accidents, which happen not once, perhaps, in ſeveral years.* Obſervations on the Turks, vol. 2. p. 54.

Alſo, when the particle *there* is prefixed to a verb ſingular, a plural nominative may follow without a very ſenſible impropriety. There *neceſſarily* follows *from thence*, theſe *plain and unqueſtionable* conſequences.

The word *none* may ſeem to be a contraction of *no one*, yet it admits of a plural conſtruction. *All of them had great authority,*

thority, indeed, but none *of them* were *ſovereign princes.* Smollett's Voltaire, none *of them except the heir*, are *ſuppoſed to know them.* Law Tracts, p. 211. This word is alſo found in a ſingular conſtruction. None *ever* varies *his opinion.* Raſſelas, vol. 2. p. 19.

Faults, with reſpect to number, are often made by an inattention to the proper meaning of *or* and other disjunctive particles. *Speaking impatiently to ſervants.* or *any thing that betrays inattention, or ill humour*, are *alſo criminal.* Spectator, *is alſo criminal. A man may ſee a metaphor or an allegory in a picture*, as *well as read* them *in a deſcription.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 30. read *it. But their religion*, as well as *their cuſtoms, and manners*, were *ſtrangely miſrepreſented.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, p. 123. *The author of the inſcription*, as well as *thoſe who preſided over the reſtoration of the fragments*, were *dead.* Condamine's Travels, p. 60.

Words connected with a proper ſubject of an affirmation, are apt to miſlead a writer, and introduce confuſion into the conſtruction of his ſentences with reſpect to number. *I fancy they are* theſe kind of gods, *which Horace mentions in his allegorical veſſel; which was ſo broken*

and

and ſhattered to pieces. Addiſon on Medals, p. 74. *The* mechaniſm *of clocks and watches* were *totally unknown.* Hume. *The* number *of inhabitants* were *not more than four millions.* Smollet's Voltaire. *Let us diſcuſs what relates to* each *particular in* their *order its order. There* are a ſort *of authors, who ſcorn to take up with appearances.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 28.

The word *ſort* ſeems to refer to a number of things, and the word *kind* ſeems to be more proper when the quality of one ſingle thing is ſpoken of; yet this diſtinction has not been obſerved by writers. *The nobleſt* ſort *of the true critic.* Swift's Tale of a tub. But allowing that we may ſay *a ſort of a thing*; as *a ſort of land, a ſort of wheat,* and the like; yet, in this conſtruction, the idea is certainly ſingular. In the following paſſage, however, it occurs in the plural number. *There was alſo among the ancients* a ſort of critic, *not diſtinguiſhed in ſpecie from the former, but in growth or degree*; *who* ſeem *to have been only tyro's or junior ſcholars.* Ib. p. 60.

An endeavour to comprize a great deal in one ſentence is often the occaſion of a confuſion in numbers. *Words conſiſt of* one *or more* ſyllables; *ſyllables of* one *or more*

more letters. One of the moſt aukward of theſe examples I have met with is the following: *The king was petitioned to appoint one, or more, perſon, or perſons.* Macaulay's Hiſtory, vol. 3.

Many writers, of no ſmall reputation, ſay *you was*, when they are ſpeaking of a ſingle perſon; but as the word *you* is confeſſedly plural; the verb, agreeably to the analogy of all languages, ought to be plural too. Beſides, as the verb is in the ſecond perſon, we ought to ſay *you waſt* rather than *you was*; and, in the preſent tenſe, we always ſay *you are* in the plural number, and not *you art, or you is* in the ſingular. *Deſire this paſſionate lover to give you a character of his miſtreſs, he will tell you, that he is at a loſs for words to deſcribe her charms, and will aſk you ſeriouſly, if ever* you was *acquainted with a goddeſs or an angel. If you anſwer that* you *never* was, *he will then ſay*—Hume's Eſſays, p. 224.

Section XII.

Of correſponding Particles.

THE greateſt danger of inattention to the rules of grammar is in compound ſentences, when the firſt clauſe is to be connected with two or more ſucceeding ones. There is a prodigious variety of caſes in which this may happen, and the ſtyle of our beſt writers is often extremely faulty in this reſpect. In order to preſerve an eaſy connection of the different clauſes of a ſentence, the ſtricteſt regard muſt be had to thoſe particles, which cuſtom has made to correſpond to one another; ſo that when one of them is found towards the beginning of a ſentence, the other is expected to follow in ſome ſubſequent part of it. As examples, in theſe caſes eſpecially, are more intelligible than rules, or deſcriptions; I ſhall produce a conſiderable number of the inſtances of faulty correſpondence, which have occurred to me; and ſhall inſert, in a different character, the words which would have made them grammatical, or ſubjoin that form of the ſentence, which, I think would have been better.

Equal

Equal is but ill put for *the ſame*, or *as much*, and made to precede and correſpond to *as* in the following ſentence. *It is neceſſary to watch him with* equal *vigour*, as *if he had indulged himſelf in all the exceſſes of cruelty.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 63. *A girl of twelve cannot poſſeſs* equal *diſcretion to govern the fury of this paſſion*, as *one who feels not its violence, till ſhe be ſeventeen or eighteen.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 186. And *equally* does not well ſupply the place of *as*, *This new extreme was* equally *pernicious to the publick peace* as *the others.* Ib. p. 329. *He deems the ſkirmiſhes of kites and crows* equally *deſerving of a particular narrative*, as *the confuſed tranſactions and battles of the Saxon heptarchy.* Ib. vol. 1. p. 28.

The ſame ſeems to require *that*, if more than a ſingle noun cloſe the ſentence. *Germany ran* the ſame *riſque* as *Italy had done.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 180. *The ſame riſque as Italy* might, perhaps, have done. *She reſts herſelf on a pillow, for* the ſame *reaſon* as *the poet often compares an obſtinate reſolution, or a great firmneſs of mind, to a rock, that is not to be moved by all the aſſaults of winds or waves,* Addiſon on Medals, p. 46. *The highlander has* the ſame *warlike ideas annexed to the ſound*

ſound of the bagpipe, as *an Engliſhman has to the ſound of the trumpet or fife.* Brown. *If I examine the* Ptolemean *and* Copernican *ſyſtems, I endeavour only, by my enquiries, to know the real ſituation of the planets; that is, in other words, I endeavour to give them, in my mind or conception,* the ſame *relations* as *they bear to each other in the heavens.* Hume's Eſſays, Moral and Political, p. 227.

In the ſame manner as, or, *in the ſame manner that*, may perhaps, be equally proper; but the latter conſtruction leans more to the French, and the former is more peculiar the Engliſh idiom. *He told the Queen, that he would ſubmit to her, in* the ſame manner that *Paul did to Leo.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 5. p. 51.

So does not ſeem to admit of *as*, when any words intervene between them. *There is nothing* ſo *incredible*, as *may not become likely, from the folly and wickedneſs of John.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 100.

So ſoon as, does not read ſo well, particularly in the middle of a ſentence, as, *as ſoon as. Theſe motives induced Edward, to intruſt the chief part of his government in the hands of eccleſiaſticks at the hazard of ſeeing them diſown his authority* ſo ſoon as *it would turn againſt them.* Ib. vol. 2. p. 422.

422. *Religious zeal made them fly to their ſtandards*, ſo ſoon as *the trumpet was ſounded by their ſpiritual and temporal leaders.* Ib. vol. 6. p. 280.

For the reaſon that is a good correſpondence; *for the reaſon why* is a bad one. For theſe reaſons *I ſuppoſe it is*, why *ſome have conceived it would have been very expedient for the publick good of learning, that every true critic, as ſoon as he had finiſhed his taſk aſſigned, ſhould immediately deliver himſelf up to raiſbane or hemp.* Swift's Tale of a Tub, p. 55.

That, in imitation, I ſuppoſe, of the French idiom is, by Mr. Hume, generally made to follow a comparative, *ſuch ſcenes are* the more *ridiculous*, that *the paſſion of fames ſeems not to have contained in it any thing criminal.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 6. p. 5. *Other princes have repoſed themſelves on them with* the more *confidence*, that *the object has been beholden to their bounty for every honour.* Ib. This conjunction is alſo frequently uſed by ſome of our more modern writers, in other caſes where the French uſe *que*, and eſpecially for *as*; *I never left him*, that *I was not ready to ſay to him, dieu vous faſſe, &c.* Bolingbroke on Hiſtory, vol. 1. p. 121. Perhaps *when* would be more truly Engliſh in this ſen-

ſentence, or we ſhould rather ſay, *I never left him* but, or, till *I was ready*.

It is a very common fault with many of our writers, to make *ſuch* correſpond to *who*; whereas the Engliſh idiom is *ſuch as*; and *he, ſhe, they, theſe*, or *thoſe, who*. *It is a place which, for many years, has been much reſorted to by* ſuch *of our countrymen*, whoſe *fortunes indulge them in that part of education which we call travelling*. Account of Geneva. *A high court of juſtice was erected for the trial of* ſuch *criminals*, whoſe *guilt was the moſt apparent*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 289. *thoſe criminals*.

Scarce, or *ſcarcely*, does not admit of *than* after it. Scarcely *had he received the homage of this new pointiff*, than *John the twelfth had the courage to ſtir up the Romans again*. Smollett's Voltaire. There is a much better correſpondence to this particle in the following ſentence, from the ſame author. Scarce *had he left the camp*, when *the very ſame night, one half of the emperor's army went over to his ſon Lotharius*.

When two clauſes of a ſentence require each a different particle, it is very common to forget the conſtruction of the former clauſe, and to adhere to that of the

the latter only. *He was* more *beloved, but not ſo much admired* as *Cinthio.* Addiſon on Medals. *More* requires *than* after it, which is no where found in this ſentence. *The ſupreme head of the church was a foreign potentate, who was guided by intereſts always* different, *ſometimes contrary* to *thoſe of the community.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 4. p. 35. *Never was man ſo teized, or ſuffered* half the uneaſineſs as *I have done this evening.* Tatler, No. 160. The firſt and third clauſe, viz. *Never was man ſo teized as I have been this evening*, may be joined without any impropriety; but to connect the ſecond and third, *that* muſt be ſubſtituted inſtead of *as*, and the ſentence be read thus; *or ſuffered half the uneaſineſs* that *I have done*, or elſe, *half ſo much uneaſineſs as I have done.*

Negative particles often occaſion embarraſſment to a writer, who, in this caſe, is not ſo apt to attend to the exact correſpondence of the different parts of a ſentence. *Nor is danger ever apprehended in ſuch a government from the violence of the ſovereign*, no more *than we commonly apprehend danger from thunder or earthquakes.* Hume's Eſſays, p. 133. *any more. Arioſto, Taſſo, Galileo*, no more than *Raphael*, were

not

not *born in republicks.* Hume. *Neither* certainly requires *nor* in the clauſe of a ſentence correſponding to it. *There is another uſe that, in my opinion, contributes rather to make a man learned than wiſe, and is* neither *capable of pleaſing the underſtanding,* or *imagination.* Addiſon on Medals, p. 16. *No* does but ill ſupply the place of *neither* in this correſpondence. *Northumberland took an oath, before two archbiſhops, that* no *contract, nor promiſe had ever paſſed between them.* Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 4. p. 147. *or promiſe.*

Never ſo was formerly uſed where we now ſay *ever ſo.* This form is generally to be found in the works of Mr. Addiſon, and others of his age. It is conſtantly uſed in our tranſlation of the Bible, *charm he* never ſo *wiſely.*

The comparative degree and the conjunction *but* have not an eaſy correſpondence. *Than* is preferable. *The miniſters gained nothing* farther *by this,* but *only to engage the houſe to join the queſtion of the children's marriage with that of the ſettlement of the crown.* Hume's Hiſt. vol. 5. p. 105. *Beſides* does not ſtand well in the ſame conſtruction. *The barons had little* more *to rely on,* beſides *the power of their families.*

milies. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 193. *more than*, or take away the word *more* and the conſtruction will be more eaſy. Neither does *beſides* follow in correſpondence with *other* near ſo well as *than*. *Never did any eſtabliſhed power receive ſo ſtrong a declaration of its uſurpation and invalidity; and from no* other *inſtitution*, beſides *the admirable one of juries, could be expected this magnanimous effort*. Hume's Hiſtory, vol. 7. p. 209. Nor does *but* do ſo well as *than*. *They had no* other *element* but *wars*. Ib. vol. 1. p. 104.

THE END.